Table of Contents

MPR Project No. 7666-110

Author: Alan M. Hershey

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM OPERATIONS STUDY

REPORT ON STATE CENSUS: AUTOMATED CERTIFICATION SYSTEMS

FINAL REPORT

February 1987

Prepared for:

U.S. Department of Agriculture
Food and Nutrition Service
3101 Park Center Drive
Alexandria, VA 22302

Prepared by:

Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
P.O. Box 2393
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report was prepared by Mathematica Policy Research under Contract No. 53-3198-5-51 from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, Office of Analysis and Evaluation. This report benefited from the concerted efforts of a number of people. Thanks must go to Boyd Kowal, Jill Herndon, and Chris Kissmer of the Food and Nutrition Service for their input into the design of the census instruments and their work on resolving problems along the way in our fielding of the census data collection. The cooperation and efforts of the state agency respondents are also warmly appreciated.

The interviewers who conducted the Automated Certification Systems census--Glynis Daniels and Marie Hojnacki--deserve credit for their patience, perseverance, and perceptiveness in these complex interviews. Linda Wray merits admiration for her organized and sensitive control of the data collection for all of the operations areas.

The design and programming of the basic appendix tables used for the analysis were ably performed by Jennifer Schore, and Sheila Mapes constructed the summary tables used in the text. Jeanette Lee deserves thanks for her primary role in the clerical production of the report and tables. The entire report was edited by Thomas Good.

CONTENTS

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

For the past several decades, state agencies that are responsible for administering the Food Stamp Program and other assistance programs have been developing increasingly sophisticated computer systems to support program operations. Federal funding incentives encourage the development of new systems, and concerns about certification error rates have prompted agencies to examine the increased automation of certification calculations and decisions as a way to prevent errors. Future policy decisions at the federal level depend, however, on the availability of comprehensive and systematic information on the characteristics and capabilities of Automated Certification Systems (ACS) now in use.

To collect such information, the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture has sponsored the Food Stamp Program Operations Study, an examination of Automated Certification Systems and five other areas of Food Stamp Program operations. The study is being conducted for FNS by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., and its subcontractors, Abt Associates, Inc., and the Urban Institute.

The first phase of the study--called a "census" of state agencies--has been based on telephone interviews with Food Stamp Agency staff. Interviews were conducted in 52 of the 53 states (including Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia). In 48 states, interviews were held with state agency staff. In one of these states and in four others where there is no single state-wide system, interviews were held with county agency staff in selected counties; a total of 10 such county agencies were interviewed. Thus, a total of 58 certification systems were examined.

The primary purpose of the FSPOS census interviews on Automated Certification Systems was to construct a systematic descriptive profile of certification systems now in use, and to distinguish the types of systems that might provide a basis in later analysis for associating different system approaches with differences in the cost-effectiveness of systems. The description of system characteristics was developed in terms of four broad functions: (1) data base content, (2) system input methods and staff roles, (3) eligibility determinations and benefit calculations, and (4) system outputs. The census report presents summary data on these four aspects of system operations, constructs a system typology, and then concludes with information on the direction of future system enhancements or changes planned by the agencies covered in the census.

Data Base Content of Certification Systems

The ACS census examined two aspects of certification system data bases: (1) the level of detail contained in household records, and (2) the extent to which historical data on participating households are accessible to eligibility workers.

The level of detail in household records was examined in terms of three aspects of household circumstances: income, deductions from income, and resources. The following were the major findings:

- Almost all agencies record reported gross earnings and unearned income in household records.
- Thirty-four of 58 agencies maintain data on gross earnings and unearned income by individual, rather than lumping those data together for an entire household.
- Information on self-employment income as a distinct element is maintained by 36 systems, about half of which break this income down into revenue and expenses.
- Most (40) systems capture reported housing costs whether or not an excess shelter deduction will be taken, and reported utility costs are systematically recorded in 38 systems.

Most agencies (45 of 58) maintain some type of historical household data that can be accessed by eligibility staff, and 34 of these systems provide display terminals for on-line inquiry to historical data. About half of the agencies that maintain historical data limit those files to issuance-related information. Most systems with historical data maintain more than a year's worth of information, and 30 agencies maintain three or more years of history.

System Input: Methods and Staff Roles

The census examined the methods by which data are entered into certification systems, and determined which staff (eligibility workers vs. data entry clerks) are responsible for entry. The following patterns were observed:

- Most agencies (44 of 58) require eligibility workers to complete input forms or combined worksheet/input forms.

- In 14 agencies, data can be entered directly from application forms.

- Twenty-four agencies have been able virtually to eliminate the use of manual worksheets to calculate benefits. They have been eliminated most consistently among agencies whose systems allow data to be entered directly from application forms (12 of the 14), but eligibility processing in an additional 12 agencies, although they do require input forms, has been sufficiently automated that worksheets are unnecessary most of the time.

- On-line data entry and editing are nearly universal (51 of the 58 systems), and 31 of these 51 agencies also update household records on-line.

- In most (20) of the agencies that perform on-line updating, automated eligibility processing and file updating are initiated by data entry staff rather than by eligibility workers, so that in only about 10 agencies true interactive eligibility processing is at the disposal of eligibility staff.

- The use of generic eligibility workers is almost universal, and 37 agencies use combined food stamp/AFDC application forms, but only 25 agencies have integrated the input of food stamp and AFDC data into a single process.

Eligibility and Benefit Calculation Functions

To clarify the extent of "automated eligibility processing," the census distinguished among four different functional components: (1) the scope with which systems perform eligibility tests and benefit calculations, (2) the extent to which systems prepare household-reported data as input into eligibility tests and benefit calculations; (3) the extent to which workers are able to override or review system results, and (4) the ability of the food stamp system to retrieve other program benefit information as input into the food stamp calculation. The results were as follows:

- The overwhelming majority of agencies have the capacity to perform automated eligibility tests for at least gross and net income (40 of the 48 states, and 5 of the 10 local agencies).

- Benefit calculations can be performed by certification systems almost everywhere (48 of the 53 agencies).

- Eligibility tests in terms of the status of individuals (e.g., work registration and student status) and resource limits are less common; they are performed in only 13 and 21 systems, respectively.

- Most systems (48 of 58) can calculate net income and excess shelter deductions based on the input of reported gross earnings and housing and utility costs.

- About half (27) of the systems can retrieve AFDC benefits automatically for food stamp certification purposes.

- In 19 agencies, the system performs the majority of eligibility processing, but, because this is not true in all circumstances, workers must at times input manually determined results; in 9 of these agencies, true "overrides" are possible, in which eligibility workers can examine the results derived by the system and replace them with the results they have derived manually.

- Only 7 agencies have implemented features which require workers routinely to examine the eligibility and benefit results produced by the certification system and to input an approval to trigger issuance.

System Output: Case Management, Monitoring, and Issuance

In addition to performing eligibility determination functions, certification systems can help staff manage their work, monitor household status, and carry out issuance-related functions. A variety of system features are used to provide "alerts" or "flags" to eligibility staff:

- The data bases of most systems include flags to indicate the work registration status of individuals and, when necessary, the fact that an individual has been disqualified for a program violation.

- Other "flag" functions are less common: 26 systems maintain flags that indicate outstanding verification requirements, and only 7 provide flags to prevent inappropriate switches between utility allowances based on a standard versus an actual cost.

- The certification data bases of 37 agencies provide some indication of outstanding claims against a household.

Many agencies use system reports to eligibility workers to describe their entire caseload and actions completed or required, the most common of which are reports (usually monthly) on certifications due and computer match results (47 and 42 systems, respectively). Overall caseload reports on outstanding transaction entry errors are used less commonly (30 systems).

Using the certification system to generate required notices and forms to be sent to households can relieve eligibility staff of the necessity of initiating and composing such output, and reduce the burden on clerical staff in terms of producing them. Almost all agencies (50) use their certification systems to print Monthly Report Forms, and most can generate notices of certification period expiration (42) and monthly reporting filing warnings (37). Notices of certification action can be produced by 33 systems. Only a few systems produce automated notices to households to inform them of interview appointment dates or outstanding requirements for verification.

System Types

State agencies have adopted a wide variety of approaches to system design. The features of the systems observed in the census are very much influenced by how recently they were first implemented, what software-development methods and hardware were available at that time, and state perceptions of system requirements. An analysis of the 58 systems led to the development of a typology based on two criteria:

- "Determination Mode". Distinguishes 5 system types based on how automated eligibility and benefit determination functions are used:
  - Type 1: Basic Input and Recording. No eligibility functions; all determinations are performed manually by the eligibility worker.
  - Type 2: Manual Determination and Automated Results Checking. The system performs eligibility tests and benefit calculations, but only to check the results that are determined and entered manually by the eligibility worker.

- Type 3: Stand-Alone Eligibility and Benefit Determination. Workers can use an on-line or batch computer process to have the system determine eligibility and benefits, but must then reenter the results and household data via an input form to record them on the data base.

- Type 4: Integrated Determination and Update from Input Forms. Workers prepare input forms from application data to trigger system functions which determine eligibility and benefits and also update the household record.

- Type 5: Application-Based Determination and Update. Data entry is performed directly from application forms to trigger eligibility determinations and benefit calculations by the system. No special input form is required.

o "Processing Mode." Distinguishes 3 system types based on the manner in which data entry and updating are performed:

- Type A: Batch. Household actions are processed in daily batch runs for all actions performed since the last run.

- Type B: On-Line Determination. Data entry clerks enter and edit transactions at terminals, and trigger eligibility processing for each household action as it is entered.

- Type C: Interactive Eligibility Determination. Eligibility workers themselves use terminals to enter transactions and view eligibility and benefit results determined by the system.

Table ES.1 presents the number of certification systems in each cell of this two-dimensional typology.

Anticipated Systems Changes

The classification of systems shown above is not at all static; 45 of the 58 agencies plan to enhance their systems, and 36 of these system enhancements are scheduled to be completed by the end of 1987. Eleven agencies will implement completely new certification systems. Five of these systems will be adaptations of the Alaska Eligibility Information System, which has already been adopted in North Dakota and is being implemented in Mississippi.

TABLE ES.1

CLASSIFICATION OF CERTIFICATION SYSTEMS

Determination Mode	Processing Mode A. Batch	B. On-Line	C. Interactive	TOTAL
1. Batch	5	1	-	6
2. Manual Determination and Results Checking	6	2	-	8
3. Stand-Alone Elig. and Benefit Determ.	3	2	-	5
4. Integrated Determ. and Update from Input Form	14	14	1	29
5. Application-Based Determination and Update	-	2	9	11
TOTAL	28	21	10	59

Other agencies will be implementing changes to improve automated eligibility determination functions, notice-production features, the extent to which on-line access is available to eligibility workers, the range of computer match interfaces and verification, historical data, and the integration of the food stamp system with data bases that support other benefit programs.

These planned enhancements will have several important effects. First, automated eligibility determination and benefit calculation will be nearly universal at the state agency level, since all of the state systems now classified as Type 1A (Basic Input and Recording in Batch Mode) will be upgraded or replaced. Of the 9 state systems now classified as Type 1 or 2, only 2 will remain. A second striking effect will be that some of the older systems, which use largely manual determination and batch processing, will "leapfrog" over several stages of system development by adopting systems that are highly interactive and provide extensive automated eligibility and benefit determination support. Five states will move to Type 5C systems from Type 1 or Type A by adopting the Alaska system. In general, older systems are more likely to be replaced; 8 of the 22 systems implemented before 1980 will soon be replaced, whereas only 3 of the 36 systems dating from after 1980 are slated for complete replacement.

A third probable trend is that the direct use of interactive system features by eligibility workers will be expanded. Either by implementing new systems or by expanding the number of available terminals and changing how they are used, 7 agencies will move to Type C classification, increasing from 10 to 17 the number of agencies in which eligibility workers enter transactions themselves and interact directly with the eligibility processing functions of their system.

Table of Contents

This report describes the results of interviews with state Food Stamp Agency officials which focused on the Automated Certification Systems used by their agencies. The interviews were conducted as part of the first phase of the Food Stamp Program Operations Study (FSPOS), which is being conducted by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. (MPR), and its subcontractors, Abt Associates, Inc., and the Urban Institute, under contract to the Food and Nutrition Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Other topics covered in this first phase of the study (referred to in this report as the "census" of state agencies) are claims collection, computer matching, monthly reporting, quality control, and job search activities. The results of the census interviews in these five other topic areas are presented separately in companion reports.

The Program Operations Study consists of three phases of data collection and analysis. The first phase, the "census," entailed telephone interviews with state agency staff in the 53 state-level Food Stamp Agencies (including Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia) which focused on practices and procedures in the six areas of food stamp operations named above. In the second phase, from October to November 1986, a survey was conducted with a national sample of 191 local agencies which focused on claims collection and computer match follow-up operations. Finally, in the spring of 1987, the third phase of the study will be carried out. It will consist of intensive assessments of selected sites, focusing on the costs and benefits of particularly promising examples of operations identified in the first two phases of the study. Further project reports will be issued on phases 2 and 3.

Section A of this introduction outlines the goals of the census interviews on Automated Certification Systems (ACS). Section B briefly reviews the sources of the ACS data, describing the agencies and systems included and the data collection methods used. Section C discusses the scope of reported results, and Section D describes the organization of the remainder of this report.

A. GOALS OF THE CENSUS OF AUTOMATED CERTIFICATION SYSTEMS

The primary purpose of the census interviews on Automated Certification Systems (ACS) in the Food Stamp Program was to develop a clear, consistent, and complete descriptive profile of systems currently in use, and to establish a typology which

allows systems to be distinguished according to categories based on the functions they perform to support the work of eligibility staff. This purpose was given the highest priority after a careful review during the census design period of a broader set of questions concerning ACS that are of interest to FNS. Other issues, identified at the outset of the FSPOS, included the following:

- The effects of different types of automated systems on administrative costs
- The effects of different types of systems on the accuracy and error rates of certifications
- The relative cost-effectiveness of different types of automated systems
- The relative effectiveness and efficiency of different types of systems from the perspective of eligibility workers
- The methods used by states to improve their systems, and the characteristics of states and caseloads that lead to choosing particular types of systems
- The differences in cost-effectiveness between front-end and post-certification verification systems

All six of these issues were deferred to later stages or other components of the FSPOS. Based on a review of the data commonly compiled and reported by state FSAs, and in view of the data collection constraints inherent in telephone interviewing, it was concluded during the census design period that the census data collection would not be able to create a useful data base for a serious analysis of administrative costs, the effects of systems on administrative costs or the accuracy of certifications, or cost-effectiveness. The factors that affect the choice of system approaches and methods of system improvement were also deleted from the census agenda after discussions of FNS priorities. It was determined that a study of the differences between front-end and post-certification verification would be addressed more properly under the FSPOS computer matching topic.

A systematic description and classification of automated certification systems thus emerged as the primary goal of the ACS interviews, but, during the course of the census design, FNS and MPR identified several secondary objectives. First,

it was decided that an attempt should be made to obtain some limited data on food stamp caseloads, the volume of system transactions, and the levels and costs of eligibility staff, so that at least some preliminary analyses of potential indicators of system efficiency could be performed. These preliminary analyses, it was thought, could be useful to selecting sites for the intensive assessments in the third phase of the FSPOS. Second, questions were included in the census interview to determine the schedule on which FSAs anticipate making the next major enhancement to their systems. Finally, it was decided that questions should be included to identify which states had implemented systems that had originally been developed in other states, and from which states these systems had been adopted. These three secondary objectives, however, represent a small part of the total set of census questions. The primary purpose of the interview, and of the results reported herein, is still to describe and classify food stamp systems.

B. DATA COLLECTION METHODS AND AGENCIES STUDIED

Three aspects of the ACS census provide necessary background for presenting the results: (1) the agencies covered in the interviews; (2) the method of conducting the interviews, and (3) the use of materials received from state agencies in the interviews and later analyses.

Agencies and Systems Included in the Census

The general purpose of the ACS census is to describe the systems used in each state, based on interviews with state Food Stamp Agency staff. In some states, however, automated certification systems are operated by local FSAs throughout the state, or in certain parts of the state, and there is no single state-operated ACS for the entire state. To obtain a more thorough descriptive profile of systems used throughout the United States, therefore, we included selected locally operated systems in the census. The design for the census thus called for interviews with the following FSAs:

- Thirty-seven state agencies in states with state-administered programs and state-operated certification systems (including Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia)
- Eight state agencies in states with county-administered, state-supervised programs, in which the state agency operates a state-wide system for all counties (Alabama, Georgia, Indiana, New Jersey,

North Carolina, North Dakota, South Carolina, and Wisconsin)

- Three state agencies with state-supervised programs in which the state operates a certification system for part of the state (Colorado, Maryland, and New York)

- Fourteen local agencies selected from states with county-administered programs, including:

  - Two counties in each state for Minnesota, Montana, Ohio, and Virginia--states thought not to maintain a state-operated system

  - Three counties in California, which does not maintain a state-operated system1/

  - One local agency in Colorado, Maryland, and New York, in the portion of the respective state that is not served by the state-operated system

As originally conceived, therefore, the ACS census was to include a total of 62 interviews, including 48 state agencies and 14 local agencies.

In the initial contacts made with state FSP directors to identify state agency respondents and to select county agencies, we discovered several changes in systems use which slightly altered the ACS sample. In Colorado and Maryland, we learned that the state-operated systems which had previously supported only part of the state had been expanded to support the entire state, thus eliminating the need for local agency interviews in these two states. In Virginia, we learned that a state-wide, state-operated system is being implemented to support all county agencies, so we conducted a state-level interview there rather than the two county interviews originally planned. We thus attempted a total of 59 interviews (49 state and 10 local). All were completed with the exception of the ACS interview with North Dakota, where

---

1/The design called for selecting Los Angeles County, one county from the 19-county consortium that operates the Case Data System (CDS), and one county from outside CDS.

the pressures of current work and staff shortages made it impossible for FSA staff to participate.2/

The systems discussed in the interviews with these 58 agencies illustrate both the variety of system evolutions and the rapid pace of change in system development. As shown in Table I.1, the 58 systems include some whose origins go back to the mid-1970s and earlier (12 were implemented before 1975). More than a third of the systems, however, have been implemented in the last four years. As a general rule, the systems described in the census results are the systems in place and operating at the time of the census interview, but some have just been implemented or are even in some stage of ongoing implementation or start-up.

In a few cases of states with ongoing implementation efforts

the choice of an "implementation date" in Table I.1 is a bit arbitrary and should be explained. In Mississippi, the interview covered the system whose implementation began in September 1986 and will be completed in August 1987, which is treated here and in Appendix Table A.1 as the implementation date. In New York City, the implementation of the Welfare Management System was expected to be complete by January 1987, and that is treated as the implementation date. In Virginia, the system described in the interview is partially implemented, operating only in a few counties at the time of the census interviews. It began operating, however, in September 1985, and that is used as the implementation date.

In many states, of course, system enhancements are being planned or developed, so the description of system features in this report must be recognized as a "snapshot" of current capabilities that will continue to develop. Table I.1 also presents the anticipated pattern of such changes in the near future, and Appendix Table A.1 provides the specific anticipated upgrade dates for each agency.

A more stable feature of the systems covered in these interviews is the hardware environment in which they operate. Hardware environments are of some interest because they have an effect on the feasibility of adopting systems

---

2/The system operating in North Dakota, however, was adopted from Alaska's EIS, so its characteristics can be inferred. Nonetheless, North Dakota is not included in any of the

TABLE I.1

DATE OF SYSTEM IMPLEMENTATION AND NEXT ENHANCEMENT

Next Enhancement	Implemented: Before 1979	1979-1980	1981-1982	1983-1984	1985-1986	1987[a]	Totals
1986	3	3	3	3	1	1	14
1987	9	4	4	5	0	0	22
1988	2	1	1	3	1	0	8
None Planned or Unknown Date	3	1	2	5	2	1	14
TOTALS	17	9	10	16	4	2	58

[a] For Mississippi and New York City, the interviews covered new sytems whose implementation will be completed in 1987. See Appendix Table A.1 for agency-by-agency implementation dates.

developed in one state for use in another. As indicated in Table I.2, the vast majority of certification systems operate in IBM environments.

Interviewing Method

Structured telephone interview instruments were developed after an extensive review of data already available from FNS files, earlier research, and state reports to FNS. After instrument drafts had been prepared and then reviewed by FNS, a pre-test of the instruments was conducted with three state agencies in all six of the operations areas covered by the FSPOS.3/ This pre-test led to substantial changes in the instruments to improve their clarity and completeness.

Interview respondents were nominated by state FSP directors or their delegates in preliminary telephone discussions with senior FSPOS research staff. In most instances, a single respondent was suggested, most often a senior agency staff member involved in developing policy and procedures, or staff involved in implementing automated systems in the field. In some cases, the FSP director was the respondent. In some instances, the FSP director suggested several different respondents for particular parts of the instrument. However, even when a single respondent was suggested, interviewers often encountered situations in which the primary respondent suggested other agency staff as the best source for answers to specific questions; interviewers then contacted these other staff. Of the 58 agency interviews completed, approximately 15 entailed contacting more than one respondent. The telephone interviews on Automated Certification Systems generally lasted about one hour.

Although the ACS instrument consisted almost entirely of structured-response questions, the interviewing method entailed an in-depth discussion of the questions and probes for clarifying the responses. This process was necessary because of the complexity and variety of state operations and the consequent difficulty in establishing consistent interpretations of terminologies among interviewers and between interviewers and respondents. Every completed interview was reviewed by the senior project researcher who was assigned to the ACS topic. These reviews uncovered apparent inconsistencies among interview responses and identified answers which, based on other information provided, appeared to reflect interpretations of interview terminologies

---

3/The help of agency staff in these pre-test states--Connecticut, Tennessee, and Texas--was very valuable and is gratefully acknowledged.

TABLE I.2

CENTRAL PROCESSING HARDWARE USE

System	Number of Agencies Using Hardware
IBM	43
Burroughs	1
Sperry/Univac	6
Honeywell	4
Amdahl	2
National Systems (NAS)	1
No Central Processing	1
TOTAL	58

that departed from the intent of the interview. As the interviews proceeded, these reviews thus identified the necessity for a further clarification of the intent of specific questions and their interpretation.

Based on these reviews, three steps were taken. First, "question clarification" statements were prepared and distributed to interviewers to guide them in the further administration of particular interview questions. Second, interviewers made call-backs to respondents to clarify or confirm responses and to probe further to resolve what appeared from the interviewer's perspective to be inconsistencies. Call-backs were made for this purpose to almost every responding FSA. Finally, several additions were made to the set of coded question responses defined in advance.4/

Use of Materials from State Agencies

In addition to the telephone data collection activities described above, the census phase of the Program Operations Study entailed collecting background materials from state agencies. State agencies were asked to provide a variety of materials, including application, recertification, and monthly reporting forms, computer input forms and worksheets, procedures and policy manual sections pertinent to each operations area, and any existing statistical or management reports that could supply data in response to some of the more complex census interview questions. Although the request for these materials prior to the census interviews was intended to solicit only existing data, forms, and reports, it is clear that many agencies devoted substantial efforts to assembling the materials.

The materials provided by the state agencies formed an important contextual background for an analysis of the census interview questions. In some cases, the data available in these materials provided responses to specific interview questions, which saved time in the interviews. In other instances, where the complexity or subtlety of a state's procedures or systems could not be captured completely in the structured interview responses, the background materials were

---

4/Specifically, codes were added to questions 4.00 and 5.00 to distinguish systems which include automated functions for eligibility determinations and benefit calculations that are used only to verify the manually determined results that are input by eligibility staff.

used by the researchers to ensure that interview responses were interpreted correctly.

C. SCOPE OF REPORTED RESULTS

The ACS interviews were designed to provide consistent, systematic profiles of all of the state and local systems examined, and to present the collected data in a structured form that facilitated comparisons of systems according to commonly defined dimensions. Consequently, the instrument design process emphasized developing carefully worded questions that could solicit structured, codable responses.5/ Although this approach makes it possible to compare systems and summarize system features, it also imposes certain limitations on the ability of the instrument to capture detail and subtle differences among systems. Using an interview format that consisted of more open-ended questions, and reporting on the salient features of each system in descriptive text, would provide more detail and clarity about each system. This approach was rejected, however, because it would was felt that it would complicate the process of compiling summary information and comparing systems.

The results presented in this report are based on the classification of system characteristics according to the distinctions formulated in the interview questions and response codes. However, given the format of the interviews, many questions elicited explanations of system features rather than responses that corresponded directly to response codes. Thus, interviewers took notes during the interview to capture the content of responses. It was then the job of the interviewer (often in consultation with the researcher working on this topic) to interpret the explanation and record an answer. This process involved three types of decisions: (1) interpreting the intent of the question when the explanation of system features brought out distinctions not explicitly included in the question wording or response codes; (2) selecting an appropriate response code based on the clarified sense of the question; and (3), in a few instances, adding code values to the codes originally defined, to capture important distinctions. The net effect of this process was to conceal some differences among systems or peculiarities of particular systems for the sake of describing all of the systems in comparable terms. The specific manner in which questions were interpreted, which thus provides a guide to

---

5/The ACS interview instrument is attached as Appendix B.

understanding the resulting data, is presented in Chapter II in our discussion of the ACS results.

The results presented in the body of this report are somewhat more limited in scope than the questions asked in the ACS interview, because data were largely unavailable for some questions or were provided by various agencies in different terms. This limitation pertains primarily to Module 13, which asked agencies for information on staffing, transaction volumes, and reasons for termination. The Module 13 data provided by the state agencies are presented in the detailed tables in Appendix A, but are not described in the text of the report, since item completion rates for this module were quite low, ranging from 32 percent to 80 percent. Although in many instances it is clear that state agencies maintain records in a form that could provide a source for the Module 13 items, it was not the intent of the census to prompt major programming or analytical efforts involving staff other than the interview respondent. Some respondents did indeed go to considerable lengths to obtain responses, but in some instances the burden of developing statistical responses was viewed quite justifiably as beyond the appropriate or intended effort called for in this study.

D. ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

The remainder of this report consists of four sections. Section II presents a summary of the descriptive data collected in the ACS census, with tables and accompanying text to explain the patterns of system use under major functional headings. Section III describes the major system types that can be distinguished from the census results, and classifies the systems according to this typology. Section IV presents observations about apparent trends in systems use based on the ACS census.

Table of Contents

The results of the census interviews on Automated Certification Systems are presented in this section under four major topics:

1. Data base content

2. System input: methods and staff roles

3. Eligibility and benefit calculation functions

4. System outputs

These topics are intended to portray the major characteristics of certification systems from the perspective of eligibility staff using the system. Section A begins this summary by describing the breadth and detail of the information that is recorded by certification systems about household characteristics and circumstances. Section B presents the methods by which food stamp agencies enter data into their systems, and the roles that eligibility workers and data entry staff play in this process. Section C summarizes the functions available in certification systems for automated eligibility determinations and benefit calculations, breaking these functions down into detailed components. Finally, Section D describes the notices to participating households and the reports to eligibility workers that are generated by the certification systems.

The format of this section is intended to provide a summary view of system use across all states, as well as to clarify the interpretation of the data. Results are presented in summary tables which show the number of systems that exhibit particular characteristics. Detailed agency-by-agency tables which show the responses to all census interview questions are presented in Appendix A, and each summary table in this chapter ends with a reference note to the relevant Appendix A table containing the underlying data. Where necessary, in the text of this section, we provide explanations of the intent and interpretation of questions, any problems in interpretation which may have affected the recorded responses from particular agencies, and the special features of particular systems whose characteristics are not fully captured by the coded responses alone. In both the summary tables and the text, references are made to the question

numbers in the ACS interview from which the data are derived, to facilitate referring to the interview instrument included as Appendix B.

A. DATA BASE CONTENT

The range of functions that can be performed by a certification system for Food Stamp Agency staff is inevitably constrained by the data that are entered into and stored in the system's data base. At a minimum, shifting responsibility for financial eligibility tests and benefit calculations to the certification system requires entering details about household income. Expanding system eligibility processing necessitates extending the scope of the data base to include, for instance, individual status characteristics to support individual eligibility tests, or asset values to support resource ceiling tests. An agency's ability to extract useful statistical data on household characteristics depends on the level of detail stored (as well as, of course, on the agency's programming resources or the availability of report-writing software packages). The capacity of a system to inform workers of prior actions requires storing historical data. Using the certification system to remind workers to take required actions implies storing a variety of potential data items which indicate circumstances that may call for the attention of workers: application or monthly report filing status, compliance with requirements for the verification of application information, compliance with work registration requirements, etc.

This section of the systems summary presents information on the scope and detail of the data on household characteristics and circumstances that are stored in certification systems. The discussion and tables consist of two components: information on the level of detail on financial circumstances contained in household records, and information on the extent to which historical data are accessible to eligibility staff. Section D describes the additional data maintained on household records to provide alerts or flags to eligibility staff about the status of the household or actions required.

Content of Household Records Circumstances

Although the Food Stamp Program provides benefits to households, the certification process requires collecting data on and making decisions about the circumstances of individual household members, as well as the household as a whole. Individual-level information is necessary for maintenance of much of the detailed data that was asked about in the interviews. The ACS interviews determined that all but eight of the systems that were examined maintain individual records

for all household members, including all adults and children (Q3.02).1/ Because only three of these eight systems were state agency systems, almost all states maintain individual records at the state level. In some systems, however, individual records may contain only identifying and demographic information.

Information was collected in the ACS interviews on the level of detail captured on household records in terms of three categories of financial circumstances: income, deductions from income, and resources. These elements are of particular interest because they are essential for implementing automated eligibility tests. Moreover, the ability to capture and store more detailed financial data is necessary if the task of preparing reported circumstances for eligibility tests is to be shifted from the eligibility workers to an automated function.

Income Detail. Several issues were explored. With respect to income, we were interested in whether income information is included in the data base at all, and, if so, whether it is maintained as a single value or as multiple fields with greater detail. This issue was explored in terms of reported gross earnings and unearned income with questions that determined whether the income data are maintained at all, and, if so, whether the information is maintained as a single income figure for the entire household or as separate entries for each individual with income (Qs 3.04 and 3.06).

A different set of distinctions was investigated for self-employment income (Q3.05). This question sought first to determine whether agencies store any distinct information on self-employment income other than a net figure included as part of a gross or net earnings figure. If they do, this question then sought to clarify whether the system data base captures only net self-employment income as computed manually by the eligibility worker, or stores both an income figure and an expense figure.

Tables II.1 and II.2 summarize the extent to which certification systems include income data. Information on reported gross earnings is stored almost universally (in 55 of the 58

1/The eight agencies whose systems do not maintain individual records for all household members are Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Minnesota-Kandiyohi, Montana-Cascade, Montana-Lewis and Clark, Ohio-Cuyahoga, and the Virgin Islands.

Table of Contents

TABLE II.1

DATA BASE CONTENT:
AGENCIES STORING EARNED AND UNEARNED INCOME

How Information Is Stored in Data Base (3.04)	Gross Earnings	
	Number of Agencies	Percent of Agencies
Not at All	3	5%
For Household as a Whole	21	36%
By Individual	34	59%
Total	58	100%

NOTE: Detailed agency-by-agency data are presented in Appendix A, Table A.6.

TABLE II.2

DATA BASE CONTENT:
AGENCIES STORING UNEARNED INCOME

How Information Is Listed in Data Base (3.06)	Number of Agencies	Percent of Agencies
Not at All	3	5%
For Household as a Whole	6	10%
For Entire Household by Income Category	16	28%
By Income Category and individual	33	57%
Total	58	100%

NOTE: Detailed agency-by-agency data are presented in Appendix A, Table A.6.

systems; of these 55 systems, 33 maintain data on both earned and unearned income by individual). Distinguishable data on self-employment is maintained less consistently. As shown in Table II.3, 22 agencies lump net self-employment income together with other earnings if any exist, and of the remainder more than half record only net self-employment income, with no information about the underlying income and expenses.

The level of available detail on unearned income is a function not only of whether individual recipients of such income can be distinguished, but also of the degree to which different sources of income can be recorded. As shown in Table II.4, the number of categories that are used to distinguish types of unearned income received varies widely, from 1 to 55 (Q3.07). In general, agencies that distinguish only one or a few types of unearned income do so by providing separate fields on their data base for specific income types and possibly a catch-all "other" field. Agencies that reported being able to distinguish large numbers of income sources do so by allocating one or a few fields for entering income amounts and by using associated fields where descriptive codes are entered to indicate the source of each income amount.

Income Deductions. Systems that maintain computer files are likely to include deductions from income as allowed in the benefit calculation, whether the benefit is computed by the system or by the eligibility worker. Therefore, census questions focused instead on the extent to which the reported circumstances which affect the allowable deduction are captured in the data base. This issue is of interest for two reasons. First, capturing data on reported circumstances is one prerequisite for developing automated features to compute deductions and relieve eligibility workers of that function. Second, the availability of "raw" data on these circumstances provides a basis for analyzing the implications of changes in deduction policy.

The notable census findings on income deductions, summarized in Table II.5, concern the extent to which the reported cost of housing and the cost of utilities are entered into and stored in the data base:2/

2/The ACS interview also asked about data base fields for reported medical and dependent care expenses (Q3.15 and 3.16); the results are included in Table A.6 in Appendix A.

TABLE II.3

DATA BASE CONTENT:
AGENCIES STORING SELF-EMPLOYMENT INCOME

How Information Is Stored in Data Base (3.05)	Number of Agencies	Percent of Agencies
No Distinct Data Base Entry for Self-Employment Income	22	38%
Distinct Data Base Entry for Net Self-Employment Income and Expenses	20	34%
Total	58	100%

NOTE: Detailed agency-by-agency data are presented in Appendix A, Table A.6.

TABLE II.4

DATA BASE CONTENT:
AGENCIES WITH NUMBER OF
UNEARNED INCOME CATEGORIES

Number of Categories of Unearned Income Stored in Data Base (3.07)	Number of Agencies	Percent of Agencies
1-5	13	22%
6-10	15	26%
11-15	7	12%
16-20	6	10%
21-25	9	16%
26-40	4	7%
41-55	4	7%
Total	58	100%

NOTE: Detailed agency-by-agency data are presented in Appendix A, Table A.6.

TABLE II.5

DATA BASE CONTENT:
AGENCIES STORING HOUSING AND
UTILITY COSTS FOR INCOME DEDUCTIONS

When Information Is Stored in Data Base	Income Deductions: Housing Costs (3.08) Number of Agencies	Income Deductions: Housing Costs (3.08) Percent of Agencies	Income Deductions: Utility Costs Number of Agencies	Income Deductions: Utility Costs Percent of Agencies
Not Stored as Distinct Element	11	19%	11	19%
Stored under Certain Condition[a]	7	12%	38	65%
Always Stored	40	69%	9	16%
Total	58	100%	58	100%

NOTE: Detailed agency-by-agency data are presented in Appendix A, Table A.6.

[a] For housing: If an excess shelter cost is taken.
For utilities: If cost is greater than standard.

- The systems of most agencies (40 of 58) capture reported housing costs for all households, whether or not an excess shelter deduction is expected to be taken (Q3.08)

- Eleven systems do not store a separate figure for reported housing costs at all. In 5 of these (Arizona, Illinois, Kansas, Missouri, and Pennsylvania), housing costs are combined with utility costs as a single field on the data base.3/

- Data on reported utility costs can be entered into and stored in 47 of the 58 systems, but in 38 of these 47 systems the data are entered only if the actual cost rather than a standard utility allowance is to be used in the excess shelter deduction calculation.

Resources. A resource test must be performed as part of every food stamp certification. However, Food Stamp Agencies have paid relatively little attention to ensuring that data on the value of reported resources (Q3.18) are maintained in their automated systems. Maintaining resource data may be given low priority because resources rarely are the basis for benefit denial. As indicated in Table II.6, more than half of the agencies' systems do not capture resource values at all; eligibility workers are expected to compare resource values with the eligibility ceiling, but are not required to enter resource data into these systems unless excess resource value calls for entering a denial or termination transaction. Of the agencies that do record resource values, 12 maintain only the total value of all resources, without distinguishing the type. In 9 agencies, however, both the resource gross value and other factors affecting its countable value are recorded in the data base, at least for some types of assets. This feature provides a basis for developing system functions to analyze resources and to compute the extent to which they should be counted against the resource ceiling in eligibility testing.

3/The data base described in the Illinois interview is the central (IPACS) data base; this data base receives summarized data from the Automated Intake System (AIS), which captures more detailed data but stores them only temporarily (up to 45 days). The AIS certification functions were the focus of the census responses on automated eligibility. The AIS does not, however, maintain a permanent database, so results on data base content refer to IPACS.

Table of Contents

TABLE II.6

DATA BASE CONTENT:
AGENCIES STORING RESOURCE VALUE

How Information Is Stored in Data Base (3.18)	Number of Agencies	Percent of Agencies
Not at All	30	52%
Total Countable Resource Value	12	21%
Countable Resource Value by Type	7	12%
Reported Resource Value by Type Plus other Factors	9	15%
TOTAL	58	100%

NOTE: Detailed agency-by-agency data are presented in Appendix A, Table A.6.

Historical Data

Having historical data readily available from computer files can help eligibility workers avoid retrieving hard-copy files when it is necessary to determine or confirm either the benefits that were issued to a household or the circumstances on which past benefits were based. The ACS census investigated whether certification systems store historical data in computer files that are accessible to eligibility workers, the length of the history retained, the manner in which the data were stored and the completeness of the historical data, and the ways in which workers can retrieve historical data.

The ACS interview asked respondents for information about all historical household data that are accessible to eligibility staff, whether they are stored as part of the same data base that contains current status information, or as part of an "archive" data base in which data for past periods or older records are spun off from the current data base. This dual set of questions was designed to avoid overlooking capabilities of providing access to history information that might take unusual forms. However, in identifying examples of historical files, we did not consider back-up tapes or files created periodically to ensure that past transactions could be audited or re-created. Only if eligibility workers could retrieve historical information from the data base for using fairly routine procedures did we conclude that an "archive" existed (Q7.09).

A total of 45 agencies reported that they maintained some type of computerized historical data base accessible to eligibility staff. In many states, the accessible history is a combination of (1) some information stored as part of the current data base and accessed by the same means as are current data, and (2) older information maintained in archive files and often accessed by other means. Table II.7 breaks down the 45 systems with historical data into the number which maintain histories as part of the current data down base and the number which maintain such data in archives, and also shows the extent to which agencies make these history files available on-line to eligibility staff. In 7 of these agencies, historical data are maintained only in an archive file separate from the current data base.

The historical data that are retained and made accessible to eligibility workers are often a summary or extract from the household record, rather than a complete record of household circumstances and eligibility and benefit results for past periods. In 23 of the 45 agencies with historical files, historical information is a limited extract from the eligibility files, most often described as "issuance data"--

Table of Contents

TABLE II.7

AGENCIES MAINTAINING
HISTORICAL DATA

History Accessible On-Line (8.06)	History in Current Data Base Only (7.11 & 7.15)		History in Archives Only (7.11 & 7.15)		History in Both Current Data Base & Archives (7.11 & 7.15)		History Not Maintained (7.11 and 7.15)		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	22	38%	1	2%	11	19%	0	0%	34	59%
No	5	9%	6	10%	0	0%	13	22%	24	41%
TOTAL	27	47%	7	12%	11	19%	13	22%	58	100%

NOTE: Detailed agency-by-agency data are presented in Appendix A, Table A.7.

household identifiers, household size, amount and date issued and recoupment amount if any (Q7.11). However, 22 of the

agencies reported that historical files are maintained with the same data content as is maintained for current status records. In 5 of these systems, complete household records are stored as history in archive files separate from the current data base, and those archive files are the only form of an historical data base (Table A.7).

Most agencies place limits on the length of the historical files they maintain. In some agencies, the length of the retained history is defined in terms of the number of previous eligibility actions that can be kept on the file, whereas others retain records up to a certain number of previous months. Table II.8 shows the distribution of certification systems according to the length of the household history maintained in both current and archival data bases (Qs 7.13 and 7.17). It should be noted, however, that responses to the length of files that are reported in terms of months can indicate two different approaches to placing limitations on length. A response such as "24 months," for instance, can mean that (1) records of actions or statuses are purged from the data base when they are 24 months old, but the history is maintained as a series of previous statuses or actions, the number of which is also limited to some total less than 24; or (2) the system actually stores the last 24 months of household data and issuance information as monthly records.

The usefulness of historical information on the data base depends of course on the ease with which eligibility workers can refer to it. The ACS census asked respondents whether eligibility workers obtain household information from the data base either in hard-copy form or by on-line inquiry, and, if the latter, how far back they could go to obtain historical information (Qs 8.02 and 8.06). These questions determined that:

- Thirty-four systems allow on-line inquiry to historical data, and all but 3 of these also allow workers to retrieve the historical data in hard-copy form.

- Twenty-one systems allow workers to retrieve data in hard-copy form but not by on-line inquiry, although 4 of these allow workers to retrieve a hard-copy record only of current status information.

Table of Contents

TABLE II.8

LENGTH OF HISTORY MAINTAINED
IN AGENCIES' CURRENT OR
ARCHIVAL DATA BASES

Length of History	Current Data Base (7.13) Number of Agencies	Current Data Base (7.13) Percent of Agencies	Archival Data Base (7.17) Number of Agencies	Archival Data Base (7.17) Percent of Agencies
Defined in Months:				
1-6	7	12%	1	2%
7-12	6	10%	1	2%
13-24	4	7%	2	3%
25-36	4	7%	4	7%
37-84	4	7%	2	3%
Unlimited	7	12%	8	14%
SUBTOTAL	32	55%	18	31%
Defined in Actions:				
1-11	2	3%	0	0
12-47	3	5%	0	0
48	1	2%	0	0
SUBTOTAL	6	10%	0	0
No History Maintained in Data Base	20	35%	40	69%
TOTAL	58	100%	58	100%

NOTE: Detailed agency-by-agency data are presented in Appendix A, Table A.7.

- In some systems (7) that allow both hard-copy and on-line retrieval of historical information, the two forms access histories of different lengths. This variable access is due to the fact that either (1) one form accesses the historical data on the current data base, and the other form accesses an archive file, or (2) on-line inquiry is available to access a special-history file on the current data base that stores selected issuance-related data, but is not available to access the complete current household record.

B. SYSTEM INPUT: METHODS AND STAFF ROLES

Section A described in some detail the information that is stored in certification systems, and Section C will describe the extent to which agencies have automated the decisions and calculations that draw on information stored in these data bases. Before we present the material on automated eligibility functions, however, it is appropriate to describe how information is entered into the systems we studied, since an important distinguishing characteristic of certification systems is the ease, directness, and simplicity with which information is moved from application forms into system files so that eligibility software can carry out the available automated functions.

Two broad issues are examined in this section. First, we review census results on the methods used to enter data into the certification system, including the type of entry source document used, the availability of on-line editing and file updating, and the extent to which eligibility workers use on-line eligibility functions directly. Second, we describe results pertaining to the integration of system features for food stamp and AFDC actions.

System Input Methods

The definition of the process for entering data into certification systems depends largely on the functions for which the system is used, and most importantly whether or not the system is routinely used to perform eligibility determinations and benefit calculations. To establish the context for our examination of input methods, we first focus on the overall extent to which systems perform automated eligibility testing and benefit calculations".

In Table II.9, we categorize systems based on Questions 4.00 and 5.00 to describe how agencies use automated eligibility testing and benefit calculations. Systems are classified as a

Table of Contents

TABLE II.9

AGENCIES WITH AUTOMATED
ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION AND
BENEFIT CALCULATION

Status of Automation	Eligibility Determination (4.00) Number of Agencies	Eligibility Determination (4.00) Percent of Agencies	Benefit Calculations (5.00) Number of Agencies	Benefit Calculations (5.00) Percent of Agencies
Not Automated	10	17%	5	8%
Partial Automation	7	12%	7	12%
Automated	41	71%	46	80%
TOTAL	58	100%	58	100%

NOTE: Detailed agency-by-agency data are presented in Appendix A, Table A.8.

YES response to Question 4.00 if they perform any eligibility tests whose results are used to define the eligibility decision. For instance, even if eligibility workers must perform some tests manually (e.g., the resource test and student status test), the system was coded as having automated eligibility determination when the worker need not perform other tests manually. Systems are coded as having PARTIAL automated eligibility functions if they perform tests that duplicate those performed manually by eligibility staff to check the results that the workers input into the system.4/ Similarly, systems are coded as having a PARTIAL automated benefit calculation function if the system is fully capable of deriving benefits from input data but is actually used only to check the input results of workers.

As also shown in Table II.9, only 10 agencies report not having any automated eligibility function, and only 5 report not having any automated benefit calculation function. Clearly, the major sources of variation in today's certification systems are no longer captured by a simple distinction between those that do and those that do not have "automated eligibility." Examining the details of how data enter the certification system and how workers use the system reveals more variation.

Input Source and Use of Worksheets. The contribution of certification systems to the work of eligibility staff is reflected largely in the extent to which the system helps reduce the transcription of information from application or recertification forms completed by applicants to other forms that serve as input sources for entry into the certification system. As shown in Table II.10, most agencies (44 of 58) report using an input form or a combined input form/worksheet prepared by the eligibility worker. At the other extreme, 5 agencies (Alaska, Nebraska, New York State and City, and Texas) report that the design of their systems allows data to be entered directly from the application form as completed by the applicant, without having to complete a separate input

---

4/Many or most systems that were coded as not having automated eligibility functions also perform some type of editing to check the accuracy of worker input. We have attempted to distinguish as having PARTIAL automated functions those systems in which this checking function entails selecting the appropriate tests (e.g., whether to use the gross income test) and using external tables or standards for comparison with input data, as opposed simply to checking internal arithmetic consistency.

Table of Contents

TABLE II.10

SOURCE OF INPUT
INTO SYSTEM AND
PERCENT OF APPLICATIONS
FOR WHICH WORKSHEET IS COMPLETED

Percent of Applications for Which Worksheet Completed (6.09)	Input Source (6.08)								Total (All Sources)	
	Input Form		Input Form and Worksheet		Application with Worker Input		Application Form			
	Number Agencies	Percent Agencies	Number Agencies	Percent Agencies	Number Agencies	Percent Agencies	Number Agencies	Percent Agencies	Number Agencies	Percent Agencies
0	7	12%	0	0	3	5%	5	9%	15	26%
1-25	6	10%	1	2%	3	5%	0	0	10	17%
26-75	1	2%	0	0	1	2%	0	0	2	4%
76-100	20	35%	9	16%	1	2%	0	0	30	53%
TOTAL	34	59%	10	18%	8	14%	5	9%	57[a]	100%

NOTE: Detailed agency-by-agency data are presented in Appendix A, Table A.8.

[a] Virgin Islands excluded from this table because input process does not establish data base.

form or even to record additional information on the application form.5/ In an additional 8 states, data can be entered directly from application forms, but workers must first add summary fields or codes which indicate the proper use of the applicant's data before the form is entered.6/

Where data can be input directly into the certification system from an application form, eligibility workers need not generally use worksheets to perform manual calculations, as shown in Table II.10. Of the 13 agencies (excluding the Virgin Islands) that enter data from application forms, 11 reported that worksheets are used for less than 2 percent of all applications (Q6.09).

Even where traditional input forms are completed by workers, the extent of the data preparation, eligibility testing, and benefit calculation functions of the system vary substantially (see Section C). Even within this group, differences exist in the degree to which workers must perform manual computations before filling out the input form. Of the 34 agencies which reported that data are entered from regular input forms, 13 reported that workers must complete worksheets for less than 25 percent of all applications; of these 13, 12 complete worksheets for less than 7 percent of all applications, and 7 of those 12 agencies do not use worksheets at all. It is likely that in some of these agencies the scope of automated eligibility functions is just as developed as it is in some of the states that enter data directly from applications. In 20 of the remaining 21 agencies which use traditional input forms, workers reportedly must complete separate worksheets for 100 percent of all applications.

5/Although the Virgin Islands is coded as using the application form as a direct source, it is not counted with this group because no computerized data base exists. Workers use microcomputers as budgeting aids, entering information from application forms to determine allotment amounts, but no permanent data base records are established.

6/The input source response for one state, Illinois, is in fact a special case. In the Illinois automated intake system, data are entered from oral responses during the intake interview, so there is, properly speaking, no hard-copy source document. However, the Illinois system for ongoing recertifications and changes still requires that workers prepare a traditional input form.

Use of On-Line Functions. Rapidly completing the entry of household actions, resolving problems with entered transaction data, and executing whatever automated eligibility processing is available are a concern to the users of certification systems. One factor that determines the speed with which these steps can be completed is whether and how the on-line, interactive processing of individual household transactions is made possible. The ACS census distinguished two separate factors associated with using on-line functions: whether on-line processing as opposed to batch processing is possible, and who uses the on-line functions. Census questions addressed four key issues:

1. Whether the data entry process provides immediate edit feedback on errors or inconsistent data, and, if so, whether the edit feedback is derived only from editing the data on the input form against standard edit rules, or whether the edits also determine the consistency of the entered data with the data already on the household record (Q9.00)

2. Whether the process of updating the household record on the data base, once any edit problems are resolved, occurs in regularly scheduled batch runs for all pending transactions, or as an on-line process that is initiated case-by-case at the completion of data entry and edit resolution (Q9.01)7/

3. The extent to which on-line eligibility and benefit calculation functions are used by eligibility

---

7/Several agencies reported that on-line updating was possible, but was not always used. Based on interview notes, we believe that these are systems which allow workers to trigger immediate record updates and eligibility functions in situations in which they need to know the determination results; however, when immediate results are not needed, they may enter and process transactions after some delay.

workers themselves to obtain immediate results (Qs 4.10 and 5.03)8/

4. Whether or not eligibility workers use on-line terminals during interviews, and, if so, whether they used them at intake or recertification or both (Q2.01). The intent of this question was to identify agencies in which workers use the system as a tool that guides the interview process, or as a tool for entering application data during interviews. Systems were not considered to have this feature if, before an interview or at the start of an interview, screening or eligibility staff used system inquiry functions only to determine what information about the applicant was already on file.

Several observations based on these interview items are worth noting. First, as shown in Table II.11, on-line data entry and editing are nearly universal; 51 of the 58 agencies reported that the staff who enter data obtain on-line edit results. In the remaining 7 agencies, editing is a batch process, and input errors most likely introduce at least a day's delay in eligibility processing. Not surprisingly, the updating of household files in these 7 agencies is also a batch process. In 20 of the 51 agencies which have on-line data entry and editing, the entry process creates transactions that are then processed in batch runs in order to update household records and determine eligibility and benefits (if such functions are available).9/ In 30 systems, the full

---

8/ It should be noted that these questions required frequent clarification, since many respondents at first interpreted the question as referring to the percentage of applications for which the eligibility and benefit calculations occur on-line, whether they are initiated by data entry clerks or by eligibility staff. It is possible that, due to miscommunication, a few states may be counted as performing 100 percent of eligibility determinations on-line when in fact it is data entry staff rather than eligibility workers who use the capability for on-line determinations.

9/ South Dakota is not counted among the agencies in which updating is performed in batch, although the interview response (see Table A.8) indicates batch updating. The interview response appears to refer to the "background processing" of updates initiated on-line, case-by-case, by eligibility workers. This feature was described in the interview on the Vermont ACCESS system, which has been implemented in South Dakota.

TABLE II.11

AGENCIES IN WHICH EDITING AND
UPDATING ARE PERFORMED ON-LINE BY
ELIGIBILITY WORKERS

Percent of Eligibility Determinations Done On-Line (4.10)	On-Line Editing Performed (9.00)						On-Line Updating Performed (9.01)					
	Yes		No		Total		Yes		No		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0	28	49%	5	9%	33	58%	15	26%	18	31%	33	58%
1-25%	8	14%	1	2%	9	16%	5	9%	4	7%	9	16%
26-89%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
90-100%	14	25%	1	2%	15	26%	10	18%	5	9%	15	26%
TOTAL	50	88%	7	12%	57	100%	30	53%	27	47%	57*	100%

NOTE: Detailed agency-by-agency data are presented in Appendix A, Table A.8.

[a]Totals appear inaccurate due to rounding error.

[b]The Virgin Islands is excluded from the table because its microcomputer (on-line) use does not create any permanent file update, and is therefore not counted as having either batch or on-line editing and updating.

triggering available eligibility functions is performed as an on-line process case by case.10/

Among agencies whose systems are designed for on-line updating and eligibility determination, a distinction remains between those agencies in which the task of entering data and triggering updates and eligibility processing is performed by data entry workers, and those agencies in which eligibility workers themselves use the system directly via display terminals. In some agencies, data entry staff are usually responsible, but eligibility staff have access to terminals and can enter data and examine eligibility and benefit results immediately when necessary. Table II.11 shows that the 30 agencies capable of on-line entry and update fall into three categories:

1. Agencies in which on-line entry and updating are always performed by data entry staff, and eligibility staff do not interact directly with the system (i.e., in which the percentage of eligibility determinations and benefit calculations performed on-line by eligibility workers is zero--15 systems)

2. Agencies in which data entry staff are usually responsible for entry and update, but in which eligibility staff have access to terminals and, in exceptional circumstances, will carry out the entry and update process themselves to obtain immediate results from the automated eligibility and benefit calculation functions of the system (5 systems, with the percentages of worker-initiated on-line determinations ranging from 1 to 25 percent).11/

3. Agencies in which eligibility workers generally use terminals themselves to enter household data,

---

10/Only 50 of the 51 systems with on-line editing are accounted for because the Virgin Islands agency, although it uses microcomputers for computing household budgets (and thus has on-line input and editing), does not perform any permanent file update, and is therefore not counted as having either batch or on-line update.

11/This total excludes South Dakota and Vermont, where workers can both obtain immediate results and enter transactions into a queue for background processing.

trigger the eligibility functions of the system, and review the results (10 systems, with the percentages of worker-initiated on-line determinations ranging from 90 to 100 percent). This total includes South Dakota and Vermont.

These results reflect a number of judgments about the assignment of certification systems to categories. These decisions were required for systems in which the overall process of determining eligibility and benefits and of updating files actually involves several different systems or processing approaches. For these systems, the simple coded responses recorded for interview questions either appear contradictory, are somewhat misleading, or conceal the true complexity of available systems functions. These unusual cases are as follows:

- New Jersey eligibility workers use one system to perform automated eligibility and benefit calculations (Qs 4.10 and 5.03), but must prepare inputs into a separate system to record results and trigger issuance. Both the editing of those separate inputs (Q9.00) and the updating of files (Q9.01) are batch processes. New Jersey is treated as an agency with batch updating, although 100 percent of its automated eligibility processing is performed on-line by eligibility workers.

- The systems of Vermont and South Dakota allow eligibility workers to enter data and initiate eligibility processing, but enable them choose between "rush" processing for an immediate examination of results or a lower priority processing called "background." Thus, 100 percent of determinations are initiated by the worker, but staff estimated that in only 10 percent of all transactions is the "rush" processing requested (Qs 4.10 and 5.03). South Dakota and Vermont are treated as agencies in which updates are performed on-line and all determinations are initiated by the worker.

- Illinois described separate systems now used for intake and ongoing actions: an intake system which is used directly by intake eligibility workers to enter data and trigger eligibility processing, and a separate system for ongoing case actions which requires that determinations, the completion of input forms, and batch editing and updating be performed manually. Table II.11 data pertain to the Automated

Intake System, showing that most of the eligibility processing in Illinois is performed on-line.

- The systems of New York State and City allow eligibility staff to enter and edit household data and determine eligibility and benefits on-line (Qs 9.00, 4.10, and 5.03), but the transfer of data from the budgeting system to the data base used for issuance is a batch update process (Q9.01). In Table II.11, they are counted among agencies that have batch updating, but as performing 100 percent of their determinations on-line.

- The system of Pennsylvania operates differently for intake and ongoing actions. The data entry and updating of household records is always an on-line function (Q9.01). On-line determinations for ongoing actions are never performed by eligibility workers themselves (Qs 4.10 and 5.03); workers complete input forms, which are then entered by data entry staff. For intake actions, however, eligibility workers can use a separate on-line budgeting function to derive results, which they then record using input forms in the system data base. Pennsylvania is counted in Table II.11 as having on-line updating since it is available in both systems, but is categorized as not having on-line determinations of eligibility, based on the processing characteristics associated with ongoing household transactions.

- The respondent from North Carolina could not offer an estimate of the percentage of determinations performed by eligibility workers themselves with the on-line budgeting function (Qs 4.10 and 5.03). However, because the respondent indicated that workers use this function "most" of the time, North Carolina was counted among the 14 systems in which eligibility workers control the eligibility function themselves.

Integration of Food Stamp and AFDC Input

Although the ACS census focuses on the support provided by automated systems to the food stamp certification process, a complete picture of the usefulness of these systems cannot be constructed without some information on the relationship between the processing of food stamp actions and AFDC actions. The census interview therefore included several sets of questions to determine the extent to which the staff responsibilities, application and input forms, and system reports of food stamps and AFDC are integrated.

System integration is a desirable goal only if eligibility staff themselves are responsible for the eligibility determinations and actions associated with both programs. All but 6 of the agencies that were interviewed reported (Q12.00) that they use "generic workers" (i.e., eligibility staff who take applications and perform eligibility determinations for both food stamps and AFDC for those households which apply for both programs). Two of the 5 agencies that use generic workers (North and South Carolina) use them only in certain counties. The census instrument was not designed to determine whether these generic workers are in special "PA units" or whether all eligibility workers handle both programs according simply to the needs of the individual household. Three respondents, however (from Louisiana, West Virginia, and Wyoming), indicated that all of their eligibility workers are "generic."

When eligibility workers collect application information for and are responsible for eligibility determinations in both programs, providing a single application form can ease the burden on applicants and simplify the intake process for eligibility workers. Similarly, providing generic workers with a single input form that captures the necessary information for both programs can improve the efficiency of the worker's job. At a minimum, using a single form can avoid the necessity of entering duplicative names and characteristics of household members, and may also allow single entries to be made for financial data necessary to process eligibility for both programs. Table II.12 shows the extent to which agencies use combined application forms (Q12.01) and combined input forms (Q12.02).

Requiring eligibility workers to complete separate input forms for food stamp and AFDC actions is still a very common practice, and a measure of the degree to which the integration of systems remains unaccomplished is shown in Table II.12. A total of 33 agencies reported that they do not use a combined input form, yet 27 of these agencies use generic workers. Simplifying the burden on PA food stamp applicants by requiring them to see only a single generic worker and to complete a single application form has been accomplished more widely than has integrating the worker's mode of preparing data for entry. Although 37 agencies use a combined application form for food stamps and AFDC (Q12.01), 14 of these agencies use generic workers to collect combined application forms, who then must complete separate input forms for the two programs.

Table of Contents

TABLE II.12

AGENCIES' INTEGRATION OF
FOOD STAMP AND AFDC
DATA COLLECTION

Combined Input Form (12.02)	Combined Application Form (12.01) Yes Number	Yes Percent	No Number	No Percent	Total Number Agencies	Total Percent Agencies
Yes	22	38%	3	5%	25	44%
No	15	26%	17	29%	32	56%
TOTAL	37	64%	20	34%	57[a]	100%

NOTE: Detailed Agency-by-agency data are presented in Appendix A, Table A.9

[a]One agency respondent in the census pre-test was not asked about combined application forms.

Where certification systems integrate the entry of data for AFDC and food stamp transactions, eligibility workers find it particularly valuable to receive system information that covers transaction problems, actions required, or eligibility results in a combined form. Table II.13 shows the extent to which certification systems provide workers with caseload reports that combine information for the two programs (Q12.04). Of the 47 systems that provide workers with any reports that summarize caseload status, 26 reported providing combined reports.

The ability both to produce combined caseload reports for food stamps and AFDC and to use combined input forms would appear to be linked, which in most cases is indeed the case. In 20 of the 26 systems that produce combined caseload reports, combined input forms are used (in these systems, an integrated entry process provides data to an integrated data base). The link is not absolute, however; in the remaining six agencies, combined reports are produced even though workers use separate input forms for food stamps and AFDC.

C. ELIGIBILITY AND BENEFIT CALCULATION FUNCTIONS

We have identified and investigated four aspects of automation in eligibility determinations and benefit calculations: (1) the scope of system decision-making and calculations in preparing raw data for eligibility processing and in applying eligibility tests and benefit formulas; (2) the integration of the eligibility function with the overall process of updating household records; (3) the extent to which eligibility workers can or must review system-determined results before benefits are issued; and (4) the ability of the system to use information directly from determinations in other benefit programs as income data for food stamp certification. This section describes these four system design variables, as well as whether eligibility workers can examine household status and eligibility/benefit results at on-line display terminals.

Data Preparation for Eligibility Tests and Benefit Calculations

Certification systems can potentially perform three aspects of the eligibility process. First, they can manipulate the data supplied by applicants to prepare them for the comparisons necessary to perform financial eligibility tests and further calculations of allotment amounts. These data preparation steps entail computing utility expenses, the excess shelter deduction, dependent care and medical expense deductions, and net income. Second, they can carry out the appropriate financial eligibility tests (depending on household type), including gross and net income tests and resource ceiling tests, and checks on the status of individuals in terms of specific eligibility requirements

Table of Contents

TABLE II.13

AGENCIES' INTEGRATION OF
FOOD STAMP AND AFDC
DATA COLLECTION
AND CASELOAD REPORTING

Combined Input Form (12.02)	Combined Caseload Reports (12.04)					
	Yes		No		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	20	35%	5	8%	25	43%
No	6	10%	27	47%	33	57%
TOTAL	26	45%	32	55%	58	100%

NOTE: Detailed agency-by-agency data are presented in Appendix A, Table A.9.

(student status, satisfaction of work registration requirements, and disqualification). Finally, systems can compute allotment amounts based on the number of eligible household members, food stamp net income, and allotment formulas or tables.

As pointed out earlier, system capabilities for performing some types of automated eligibility tests and benefit calculations are nearly universal. The overwhelming majority of the agencies have incorporated automated gross and net income tests in their systems (40 of 48 states, and 7 of the 10 local agencies examined).12/ Functions to compute allotment amounts for the worker are even more widely available; only 5 jurisdictions (3 states and 2 localities) reported having no automated function to perform the allotment calculation.13/

The widely available capabilities for eligibility testing are functions which perform gross and net income tests: comparisons of household gross and net income against the relevant income limit. Less widely developed, however, are functions to test the eligibility of individuals as members of the household and to compare total household resources against the appropriate resource ceiling. As shown in Table II.14, eligibility staff in most agencies are still entirely responsible for determining the eligibility of individual household members (Q4.04) and for determining whether households are within applicable resource ceilings (Q4.05c). Only 13 of the 58 systems include system functions to check an individual's status on such items as work registration or student status, and 21 systems apply resource tests.

Benefit calculation functions were deemed available in a certification system if, at a minimum, the system derives an

---

12/The eight states that reported not having automated eligibility functions are Arizona, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Kentucky, Tennessee, Washington, and Wyoming. County agencies which lack automated eligibility functions are San Bernardino, California, and Cascade County and Lewis and Clark County in Montana. It is possible that in some of these agencies' systems there are very basic "edits" on input data against financial standards, but respondents may not have considered such features as "automated eligibility".

13/Agencies were counted as having automated determination and benefit calculation functions if they were coded as YES or PARTIAL to Questions 4.05a and 4.05b.

(student status, satisfaction of work registration requirements, and disqualification). Finally, systems can compute allotment amounts based on the number of eligible household members, food stamp net income, and allotment formulas or tables.

As pointed out earlier, system capabilities for performing some types of automated eligibility tests and benefit calculations are nearly universal. The overwhelming majority of the agencies have incorporated automated gross and net income tests in their systems (40 of 48 states, and 7 of the 10 local agencies examined).12/ Functions to compute allotment amounts for the worker are even more widely available; only 5 jurisdictions (3 states and 2 localities) reported having no automated function to perform the allotment calculation.13/

The widely available capabilities for eligibility testing are functions which perform gross and net income tests: comparisons of household gross and net income against the relevant income limit. Less widely developed, however, are functions to test the eligibility of individuals as members of the household and to compare total household resources against the appropriate resource ceiling. As shown in Table II.14, eligibility staff in most agencies are still entirely responsible for determining the eligibility of individual household members (Q4.04) and for determining whether households are within applicable resource ceilings (Q4.05c). Only 13 of the 58 systems include system functions to check an individual's status on such items as work registration or student status, and 21 systems apply resource tests.

Benefit calculation functions were deemed available in a certification system if, at a minimum, the system derives an

---

12/The eight states that reported not having automated eligibility functions are Arizona, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Kentucky, Tennessee, Washington, and Wyoming. County agencies which lack automated eligibility functions are San Bernardino, California, and Cascade County and Lewis and Clark County in Montana. It is possible that in some of these agencies' systems there are very basic "edits" on input data against financial standards, but respondents may not have considered such features as "automated eligibility".

13/Agencies were counted as having automated determination and benefit calculation functions if they were coded as YES or PARTIAL to Questions 4.05a and 4.05b.

TABLE II.14

AGENCIES IN WHICH THE SYSTEM
PERFORMS SPECIAL ELIGIBILITY TESTS

Test	System Performs Test		System Does Not Perform Test		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Individual Eligibility Test (4.04)	13	22%	45	78%	58	100%
Resource Test (4.05C)	21	36%	37	64%	58	100%

NOTE: Detailed agency-by-agency data are presented in Appendix A, Table A.10.

allotment amount based on net income and household size, whether by table look-up or formula (even if the eligibility worker derives net income manually). In fact, two additional benefit calculation functions (prorating initial-month benefits based on the date of application and reducing the allotment to recoup an outstanding claim) are widely available. As shown in Table II.15, both functions are available in 42 systems, and one or the other is available in an additional 10 systems.

The degree to which automated eligibility tests and allotment calculations actually relieve the eligibility worker of computation tasks depends on the extent to which the worker must perform manual calculations from application information to create the necessary variables for eligibility tests and allotment calculations. The ACS census asked about four functions to prepare data for these tests and calculations: (1) the computation of total net income from gross earnings and other income (Q4.02a); (2) the calculation of the excess shelter deduction, based on housing and utility costs (Q4.02c); (3) the automatic retrieval of information on other benefits received by the household, for use as income data in food stamp calculations (Q6.07); and (4) the calculation of the countable value of selected resources, such as vehicles, using reported information on assets (Q4.02b).

Table II.16 indicates the extent to which certification systems prepare data for food stamp eligibility determinations and benefit calculations. Most systems (48 of the 58) perform both net income and excess shelter deduction calculations. All systems that can perform either of these functions do both. About half of the systems examined (27 of 58) are sufficiently integrated that the system can retrieve AFDC benefits automatically as part of food stamp benefit calculations and eligibility tests.

Automated manipulation of "raw" resource data to compute a countable value is rare; only 10 agencies reported having this a function. The remaining 11 agencies that reported having automated resource ceiling tests simply require the worker to compute total countable resources, and the system checks this value against the relevant limits.

Worker Overrides

As Food Stamp Agencies increase the scope of automated data preparation, eligibility testing, and benefit calculation functions, system specifications must accommodate a wider range of possible household circumstances and situations in which decisions are made and benefits issued. In some agencies, automated eligibility functions are designed only to

TABLE II.15

AGENCIES IN WHICH THE SYSTEM
COMPUTES SPECIAL BENEFIT
ADJUSTMENTS

Benefits Computed by System	Number of Agencies	Percent of Agencies
Proration Only (5.01C)	5	9%
Recoupment Only (5.01D)	5	9%
Proration and Recoupment (5.01C and 5.01D)	42	72%
Neither Proration Nor Recoupment (5.01C and 5.01D)	6	10%
TOTAL	58	100%

NOTE: Detailed agency-by-agency data are presented in Appendix A, Table A.10.

TABLE II.16

AGENCIES WHOSE SYSTEMS PREPARE
DATA FOR ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION
AND BENEFIT CALCULATION

System Access to Other Program Benefit Income (6.07)	System Calculates Net Income and Excess Shelter Deduction (4.02a, 4.02c)					
	Yes		No		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	27	46%	21	36%	48	82%
No	1	2%	9	16%	10	18%
TOTAL	28	48%	30	52%	58	100%

NOTE: Detailed agency-by-agency data are presented in Appendix A, Table A.11.

function in routine circumstances, and workers are still expected to make manual determinations in other circumstances. In some agencies that have attempted to implement automated functions to deal with all determination situations, the risk is that gaps in the system specifications could leave workers with no prescribed procedure for issuing an eligibility decision and benefits within the context of the automated system. Some of these agencies have chosen to develop override features which allow workers to input eligibility results in circumstances in which the system cannot generate an accurate determination.

Table II.17 reports on the prevalence of system features that allow workers to "override" system eligibility and benefit results. However, caution must be exercised in interpreting the results, because a variety of system features were described in response to these questions. The questions were intended to identify systems which enabled workers to decide when system results could not be considered accurate and, instead, to determine eligibility or benefits manually and substitute their input for a system determination. An examination of questionnaire notes, however, reveals that several different features are reported by the 19 agencies in which workers have the capability of overriding eligibility or benefit results or both.

In fact, the "override" capabilities that were described include both true overrides and procedural requirements for manual input due to the limitations of the system. In Pennsylvania, Utah, and Washington, for instance, workers must determine eligibility and benefits manually at intake and then input the results, whereas ongoing decisions can be left to the certification system. This requirement is presumably related to constraints arising from processing and issuance schedules. In Iowa and Oregon, workers must input results manually for expedited service determinations. In Alabama, Delaware, New Hampshire, and Wisconsin, manual decisions and computations are necessary for retroactive determinations and issuance. In Alaska, Delaware, Indiana, Maine, Maryland, New Hampshire, South Dakota, Texas, and Vermont, it appears that true overrides are possible (i.e., workers can substitute their manual input for the determination that, in the same circumstance, could be requested from the system). Such overrides are apparently used, for example, to provide a correct issuance to households with pending appeals, or in other circumstances when the correct interpretation of household data is not possible in the automated decision routines of the system.

TABLE II.17

AGENCIES WITH INTERVENTION BY
ELIGIBILITY WORKERS IN DETERMINATIONS

Workers Can Override System's Determination (4.06, 6.01)	Workers Must Approve System's Determination to Trigger Issuance (6.04)					
	Yes		No		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	5	11%	14	30%	19	41%
No	4	9%	23	50%	27	59%
TOTAL	9	20%	37	80%	46[a]	100%

NOTE: Detailed agency-by-agency data are presented in Appendix A, Table A.12.

[a]Total number of agencies is 46 rather than 58 due to 12 agencies with exclusive conditions: the systems do not compute coupon amount, or the benefit calculation results must be re-entered to be stored.

Worker Approval of Issuance

In most systems, once input data are accepted and the system performs the eligibility and benefit calculation, the results are used automatically as the basis for issuance. Nine agencies, however, reported that their systems include a requirement that the eligibility worker examine the eligibility and benefit results of the system and enter an approval before triggering benefit issuance (Table II.17).

Several forms of requirements for an approval by workers were reported. In Alaska, Mississippi, South Dakota, and Vermont, it appears that an inspection of the system results by workers is required simply to ensure that no errors have been made in the data input for household circumstances; workers must enter an approval code before benefits are issued.

In Texas and the two New York systems, the requirement for an approval appears to stem from a system design that provides separate data bases for the detailed household records on household circumstances and eligibility/benefit results, and for central issuance purposes. In both cases, action by the worker is required to move certain requisite data from the certification data base to the issuance data base; without this action, the data are not recorded in the issuance data base, and the results of automated determinations will be "discarded."

Finally, in Connecticut, a similar approval feature is used to move data from a certification file to a central issuance data base, but only for households on monthly reporting. In Hamilton County, Ohio, agency staff reported that an approval of system results is necessary, but the form of the approval requirement was unclear.

Automatic Retention of Eligibility/ Benefit Results

Automated determinations of eligibility and benefits require that data on household circumstances be input. In most agencies that perform automated eligibility and benefit determinations, the data necessary for this function are first entered, and are then retained in the household record and are available for issuance purposes and for subsequent inquiry. Some agencies, however, have introduced automated eligibility processing but have not linked together the eligibility function and the data base update function. For some of these agencies, linking eligibility and update functions is a subsequent stage in planned system development.

In such agencies, using automated eligibility functions does not create a permanent update to a household record without reinputting of data. When the results of automated eligibility functions are not automatically stored in the

issuance data base, some of the advantages of eligibility determination are lost, since eligibility staff must reenterthe results provided by the automated determination, which also entails reentering basic data on household circumstances that were already entered to obtain eligibility results.

In such systems, the worker typically uses the automated eligibility and benefit calculation functions either by completing an input form or by entering data directly from an application to a system terminal, to construct what is often called a "mini-budget" or a "trial budget." When results are obtained, the worker then completes another input form to record the results in the permanent data base; in some cases, the results are entered from the "trial budget" output by a data entry clerk via a special entry screen. In some agencies, two different forms of automated eligibility functions are in operation. For ongoing cases, workers submit input forms that trigger eligibility determinations, benefit calculations, and updates of the household record. For intake determinations, however, the normal process for ongoing cases cannot be used; intake workers must determine benefits manually and enter their results to update the household record. Consequently, at intake, a trial budget function is available in these agencies to help the worker with the budget calculations, but the worker must then complete an input form based on the trial budget results.

Six agencies reported that they have automated eligibility and benefit calculation functions, but that the results of these determinations are not retained automatically in the household files. In New Jersey, North Carolina, South Carolina, and the District of Columbia, a trial budget or mini-budget function is available, but the results of these system calculations must then be reentered into the system to update the files that contain the permanent household record and are used to issue benefits. In Michigan, workers use an input form to record eligibility and benefit results in a central information system (CIS); they can either compute these results manually or use a Local Office Automation system to carry out the budgeting function as an aid for preparing the CIS input form. In Virginia, intake workers use a system budgeting function on-line to derive eligibility and benefit results (which they must then record on a system input form), but they perform ongoing determinations with an input form that triggers both the automated determination and the file update.

On-Line Inquiry Capability

In most instances, using a system efficiently entails not only entering data and getting the system to perform data calculations and decisions, but also examining data in household records periodically, either to review household circumstances or to examine the results of automated calculation and decision functions. Therefore, a full picture of the eligibility processing capabilities of certification systems must include information on whether or not eligibility staff can make direct on-line inquiries to the computer files that contain household data, or must examine a hard-copy printout of household data in order to confirm the contents of the household record.

As shown in Table II.18, most agencies provide eligibility workers with an on-line inquiry capability. Only 9 agencies do not provide workers with access to inquiry terminals to examine household files (and one of those, the Virgin Islands, does not provide permanent computer files). Most systems that provide on-line inquiry (34 of 49) allow inquiries to both current household records and some form of historical data.

D. SYSTEM OUTPUT: CASE MANAGEMENT, MONITORING, AND ISSUANCE

Performing the calculations and tests necessary for eligibility and benefit determinations is only one of the ways in which certification systems can support the work of eligibility staff. A wide range of systems features have been developed to (1) remind workers of the tasks they must tend to, or alert them to aspects of case status which require attention, (2) support the process of issuing benefits, (3) report to eligibility staff on the overall status of their caseloads, and (4) generate required communications to households, thus relieving eligibility workers of the task of preparing notices or forms manually. This section reviews the pattern of such system features.

Alerts and Flags

The ACS census examined four types of system functions that can potentially alert workers to special problems or help them avoid errors in managing a particular case: flagging fields, checking for duplicate participation, determining the correct reporting interval, and tracking the receipt of recertification applications forms. Table II.19 summarizes how these four types of case management aids are used.

The most common type of flag is used to indicate the disqualification of individuals from program participation due to fraud or other program violations. All but 10 systems maintain data that, when necessary, flag the fact that an

TABLE II.18

AGENCIES WITH
ON-LINE INQUIRY CAPABILITY

On-Line Access to Historical Data (8.04/8.05)	On-Line Access to Current Household Data					
	Yes		No		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	34	59%	0	0%	34	59%
No	15	26%	9	15%	24	41%
TOTAL	49	85%	9	15%	58	100%

NOTE: Detailed agency-by-agency data are presented in Appendix A, Table A.12.

individual has been disqualified from the program (Q3.24). Of the 48 systems that use such flags, 13 can indicate only the fact that someone has been disqualified, but 20 also record the period of the disqualification, and 29 record the reason.

The next most commonly used flag is a field to record information about the status of individuals who are subject to work registration requirements (Q3.21). All of the 41 agencies using such flags apply, at the least, a code to indicate whether individuals who are potentially subject to work registration requirements are exempt, and 35 of the 41 also provide a code to indicate the reason for exemption. Only 15 systems capture and retain a flag to indicate some type of compliance issue.

Almost half of the systems that were examined (26 of the 58) provide eligibility staff with some type of reminder of outstanding requirements for verification at intake or recertification. Of these 26 systems, 11 do so with a single flag, whereas 15 provide separate fields to indicate whether specific verification requirements have or have not been satisfied (Q3.20).

Seven systems include features to prevent households from switching back and forth between using the standard utility allowance and using actual utility costs more frequently than allowed by regulations (Q3.12). This protection is typically made by storing the date of the last switch and checking this date when an update is attempted to change the code that indicates whether or not the standard should be used.

The overall accuracy of eligibility processing obviously depends on precluding the necessity of establishing a new household record for households that are already receiving food stamps, or of including in a newly eligible household individuals who are already part of a participating household. The ACS interview asked whether duplicate participation checks are performed at intake, and, if so, whether they are performed on-line or in batch, or partially in both modes (Qs4.11 and 4.12). As indicated in Table II.19, 41 agencies perform such checks to alert intake workers; 34 of these agencies reportedly perform on-line checks against the caseload of the entire state. In 3 agencies, the duplicate participation check is performed on-line against the local agency caseload, and later in batch against the remainder of

TABLE II.19

AGENCIES' USE OF CASE MANAGEMENT CONTROLS AND FLAGS

System Feature	Agencies with System Feature	
	Number	Percent
Prevention of Utility Switching (3.12)	7	12%
Outstanding Verification Flags (3.20):	26	45%
-Outstanding requirements	11	19%
-Status of verification items	15	26%
Work Registration Status Flags (3.21)	41	71%
Disqualification Flags (3.24)	48	83%
-Contains period	20	35%
-Contains reason	29	50%
Duplicate Participation Checks at Intake (4.11 and 4.12)	41[a]	71%[a]
-Totally batch	4	7%
-On-line against local DB, batch against state DB	3	5%
-Totally on-line	34	59%
System Determination of MR Requirement (6.15a)	28	48%
System Determination of Certification Period (615.b)	8	14%
Tracking of Recertification Application (7.06)	15	26%

NOTE: Detailed agency-by-agency data are presented in Appendix A, Table A.13.

[a] See footnote on previous page for explanation of possible understatement of number of agencies with this feature.

the state caseload. Four agencies reported that duplicate participation checking is performed entirely in batch.14/

The system is used to determine appropriate reporting intervals primarily for decisions about whether a household is subject to monthly reporting requirements. Only 8 agencies reported that their systems determine the appropriate certification period on the basis of household characteristics at application (Q6.15b), but 28 reported that the system determines whether or not the household should be assigned to monthly reporting status (Q6.15a).

Another potential system function that can help eligibility workers manage their caseloads is the tracking of recertification applications. Such a feature can be used as a basis for system reports or inquiries to help eligibility workers determine which of the households that are due for recertification have submitted their applications, have pending applications, or require attention. Such functions, however, can be used only in agencies where application forms are entered into the system before the eligibility worker reviews them, or where at least an identifier and date of receipt are entered when the form is received. Only 15 agencies indicated having such a tracking feature (Q7.06). However, even this figure is probably an overestimate, given what appear from interview notes to be varying interpretations of the question. In three of these agencies (California-Santa Clara, Minnesota-Hennepin, and West Virginia), the function which was referred to appears to be one which scans the data base at the appropriate time each month and terminates eligibility for which are households overdue for recertification, rather than one which allows the worker to determine from the system what applications have been received and require attention. It should be noted that even the 12 remaining agencies that do have such a function do not necessarily provide workers with summary reports that show

---

14/Responses about duplicate participation may be somewhat inaccurate because of diverging interpretations of Question 4.11. Some respondents were apparently describing a system feature which allows screening or intake workers to initiate an inquiry-type function for checking the data base on specific individuals. Others interpreted the question as referring to duplicate participation checks that are invoked automatically when an application form is entered, and may have responded in the negative if their system did not have such a feature, even though the system might allow the inquiry-type check for participating individuals.

pending applications, and may instead record in each individual household record whether the application was received.

Availability of Claims-Related Data

Although a separate FSPOS report covers claims collection functions in detail, the ACS interview investigated whether eligibility workers have access on the eligibility data base or a linked data base to information about outstanding claims and collections against them. Such information may be of particular importance when households reapply for food stamps after a period of nonparticipation.

The ACS census inquired about two dimensions of variations in the availability of claims-related data on the certification system data base. First, an inquiry was made about whether any such data were available, and, if so, whether the information was available for all claims cases or only some. As shown in Table II.20, a total of 37 agencies reported that the data base accessible to eligibility workers includes indicators of at least some outstanding claims; 28 of these include all outstanding claims (Q7.01). For the most part, the remaining 9 agencies appear to include in their eligibility data base only those claims for which recoupments against ongoing issuance have been established. The second dimension of variation is the extent of the data maintained on claims activities. All but 2 of these 37 agencies record the basis of the claim, (Q7.02), and 29 reported that they record in their data bases information on the collections made against the claim and in a form that is available to workers.15/

Issuance Support Functions

With the exception of the Virgin Islands, where all benefits are issued manually, all of the certification systems that were examined provide some form of automated issuance from the household data base or a special issuance data base linked to the primary household data base. However, as shown in Table II.21, the mix of issuance methods that are used varies substantially across agencies. It should be pointed out that almost all agencies mail out benefits (Q6.12). However, it should be noted that a "yes" to Question 6.12 indicates that

---

15/However, it is unclear from the responses the extent to which eligibility workers can actually inquire and determine the history of individual payments or recoupments, as opposed simply to determining the outstanding balance.

Table of Contents

TABLE II.20

AGENCIES WITH CLAIMS DATA
AVAILABLE IN CERTIFICATION SYSTEMS

Extent Of Claims Information Maintained (7.01)	Nature of Claims Information the System Stores: Existence of Established Claim Number	Existence of Established Claim Percent	Existence and Basis of Claim Number	Existence and Basis of Claim Percent	Existence and Basis of Claim and Collection Number	Existence and Basis of Claim and Collection Percent	Total Number	Total Percent
None	-	-	-	-	-	-	21	36%
Some Claims Cases	0	0	2	4%	7	12%	9	16%
All Claims Cases	2	4%	4	6%	22	38%	28	48%
TOTAL	2	40%	6	10%	29	50%	58	100%

Table of Contents

TABLE II.21

SYSTEM ISSUANCE METHODS

Agencies Using the Indicated Methods		Combination of System Issuance Methods Used (6.11)			
Number	Percent	ATP	Issuance Listings	Electronic Transfer	None
12	21%	X			
14	24%	X	X		
2	3%	X		X	
2	3%	X	X	X	
15	26%		X		
8	14%		X	X	
4	7%			X	
1	2%				X[a]
TOTAL 58	100%	100%			

NOTE: Detailed agency-by-agency data are presented in Appendix A, Table A.15.

[a]Manual issuance (Virgin Islands).

the agency mails at least some benefits, but not necessarily to all households, and that they may mail either coupons or ATPs. Only 3 agencies--Los Angeles County, New York City, and the Virgin Islands--reported that they do not mail benefits at all.16/ In Los Angeles and New York, mailing has been replaced entirely by the electronic transfer of issuance data to local issuance stations. Certified households present identification at these stations, which are equipped with computer terminals and communications equipment to enable staff to check the issuance data base to ensure that benefits are still due for issuance.

In addition to supporting the actual issuance of benefits, many systems support the issuance of food stamp identification cards. Twenty agencies reported that their systems do play some role in ID issuance. Respondents most often mentioned that their systems generate ID cards for newly eligible households, as well as replacements for lost cards and new cards for households with address changes. Several agencies reported that the ID cards issued by their systems also serve as Automated Teller Machine cards for direct issuance from electronic data bases.

Reports to Eligibility Workers and Supervisors

Although it is clear that all of the systems provide feedback of information on individual case actions and statuses in some form, we were interested in determining the extent to which the systems covered in the census provide reports to eligibility staff on their caseloads as a whole. We posed questions about caseload reports on the premise that, in the context of at least some systems, caseload reports on actions due and caseload status could help staff organize their work and prioritize their tasks.

The census questions on caseload reports (Qs 11.00-11.03) were careful to distinguish such reports from other system outputs

---

16/In Ohio-Cuyahoga county and South Carolina, electronic issuance has replaced ATPs and listings except for special circumstances. In Cuyahoga County, checks are mailed to cash-out cases. In South Carolina, counties may designate certain cases for coupon mail-out. Although this was not explicitly stated in the interview, it appears that this special treatment may be given to households residing far from issuance offices for whom travel to such office is a problem. Both of these agencies viewed mail-out as a very minor part of their issuance process, and thus listed only electronic issuance in response to Q6.11.

pertaining to individual households. We did not, for instance, consider that caseload reports included communication back to workers of the results of individual case-transaction edits, such as individual "error sheets" or returned turnaround documents. The term "edit reports," for instance, was defined to include only reports listing all households for which transactions have been input but have outstanding errors, as a way of conveying to the worker the overall agenda of outstanding edit-resolution tasks.

Similar attention was given to ensuring that "real-time reports" were identified clearly. This term was not meant to include on-line inquiry functions which allow case-by-case look-ups of outstanding edit errors (or any of the other report contents about which questions were posed). Reports were considered to be "real-time reports" only if they presented workers with on-line listings of all households that have outstanding errors, actions due, eligibility results, or match discrepancies, with the listings reflecting all actions taken up to the time of the inquiry.

As shown in Table II.22, the most commonly used caseload reports are those which inform eligibility workers of required case actions (48 systems) and computer match results (42).

Reports on actions required most often are produced monthly (37 of the 48 systems) and, according to interview notes, appear to focus primarily on due and overdue recertifications. Similarly, reports on computer match discrepancies are produced most often on a monthly basis or less frequently (28 of the 42 systems). It is worth noting, however, that 10 agencies provide workers with daily or even real-time reports on match discrepancies.

The use of edit reports (Table II.23) reflects in large part the variety of approaches to editing and update processing. Several different categories can be distinguished among the 30 agencies that use edit reports and the 28 that do not, based on their mode of edit processing and edit reporting:

- Seven agencies have no capability for on-line editing. These 7 agencies fall into two subcategories:
  - Four agencies produce daily edit reports (DC, KS, KY, and NJ).

TABLE II.22

AGENCIES WHOSE SYSTEMS PRODUCE
CASELOAD REPORTS

Frequency of Report Production	Type of Report: Outstanding Verifications (11.00b) Number	Percent	Actions Required (11.00c) Number	Percent	Eligibility Requirements (11.00d) Number	Percent	Computer Match Results (11.00e) Number	Percent
Not at All	38	66%	10	17%	27	47%	16	28%
Real-Time on Demand	2	3%	2	3%	4	7%	3	5%
Daily	6	10%	4	7%	13	22%	7	12%
Weekly or Biweekly	0	0	5	9%	1	2%	4	7%
Monthly	12	21%	37	64%	11	19%	22	38%
Other	0	0	0	0	2	3%	6	10%
TOTAL	58	100%	58	100%	58	100%	58	100%

NOTE: Detailed agency-by-agency data are presented in Appendix A, Table A.16.

TABLE II.23

AGENCIES USING SYSTEM EDIT REPORTS

Frequency of Edit Report Production (11.00)	Number of Agencies	Percent of Agencies
Not at All	28	48%
Real-Time on Demand	6	10%
Daily	21	36%
Weekly or Biweekly	1	2%
Monthly	2	4%
TOTAL	58	100%

NOTE: Detailed agency-by-agency data are presented in Appendix A, Table A.16.

  - Three agencies do not produce edit reports, and presumably inform workers of edit problems by returning input forms to the workers, although how they are identified is unclear (MT-Cascade, WY, and GU).

- Twenty-five agencies provide some form of on-line editing (Response 1 or 2 to Q9.00), but no overall caseload edit reports. These agencies fall into two subcategories:

  - Eighteen agencies in which editing is usually or always performed by data entry clerks, and in which eligibility workers probably inform themselves of any edit problems that must be corrected by examining individual input forms that data entry clerks return to them (AL, AR, CT, DE, FL, GA, HI, MD, MT-Lewis & Clark, NV, OH-Cuyahoga, OH-Hamilton, RI, UT, VA, WA, WV, VI).

  - Seven agencies in which household actions are routinely entered by the eligibility workers themselves, who thus observe edit problems directly on their terminals, and either correct them immediately or mark the input forms as requiring later attention (IL, MI, NB, NYS, NC, OR, and SC)

- Twenty-six agencies provide on-line editing, and also produce edit reports for eligibility staff. These include:

  - Nineteen agencies in which actions are usually or always entered by data entry clerks, and edit reports provide the primary feedback to eligibility workers on transactions requiring attention (AZ, CA-Los Angeles, CA-Santa Clara, CA-San Bernadino, CO, ID, IN, IA, LA, MA, MN-Hennepin, MN-Kandiyohi, MO, NH, NM, OK, PA, TN, and WI)

  - Seven agencies in which household actions are routinely entered by eligibility workers, who thus receive both on-line edit responses and follow-up overview reports on outstanding errors (AK, ME, MS, NYC, SD, TX, and VT)

Reporting outstanding verifications is possible only when the household data base captures some type of flag describing the

status of either individual verification items or overall compliance with verification requirements. Twenty agencies reported that their systems provide information in caseload reports about outstanding verifications. (See Table II.22). Most--12 of the 20--are issued monthly, and 8 either daily or in real-time.

Forms and Notices to Households

A significant burden is removed from eligibility workers' jobs when certification systems take over the tasks of (1) recognizing the necessity for issuing a form or notice to a household, (2) formulating the household-specific contents, and (3) printing the form or notice for mailing. Table II.24 depicts the pattern of forms and notice output capabilities in the systems examined in the ACS census. Several summary observations are worth noting:

- The most commonly produced output is Monthly Report Forms (50 agencies), most likely because these forms must be produced regularly for large percentages of the caseload, and because the logic for producing these forms depends only on a monthly reporting status code and name and address information. (Some agencies, however, may print case-specific data on the forms.)

- Most systems produce notices to households of certification period expiration (42), warnings for monthly report non-filing (37), termination notices for failure to file a monthly report (35), and notices of action on applications (34) and interim changes or recertifications (33).

- Relatively few systems can be used to issue notices of appointments (9), notices of outstanding verification requirements (6), or notifications of the monthly reporting requirement (17).18/

18/Several of the reporting frequency notices are actually messages included on notices of application approval.

Table of Contents

TABLE II.24

AGENCIES WHOSE SYSTEMS PRODUCE
FORMS AND NOTICES FOR HOUSEHOLDS

Form or Notice Produced by System	Number of Agencies	Percent of Agencies
Certification Expiration Notices (11.04a)	42	72%
Appointment Notices (11.04b)	9	16%
Outstanding Verification Notices (11.04c)	6	10%
Modification of Reporting Frequencies (11.04d)	17	29%
Monthly Report Forms (11.04e)	50	86%
Monthly Report Filing Warning (110.4f)	37	64%
Termination Notice for Failure to File Monthly Report (11.04g)	35	60%
Notice of Decision on Application (11.04)	34	59%
Notice of Action on Interim Change or Recertification (11.04i)	33	57%

NOTE: Detailed agency-by-agency data are presented in Appendix A, Table A.17.

Table of Contents

State and local Food Stamp Agencies have adopted a wide variety of approaches for resolving problems with the design and implementation of systems. The variety of systems examined in the ACS census reflects three broad factors: (1) the wide range of inventive ideas that can be devised by system designers and program managers to cope with universal problems; (2) the differences among agencies in terms of the particular problems that must be overcome in order to implement an automated system and the particular managerial problems addressed by system design efforts; and (3) the resources available for system development, including the level of available technology at the time major developmental efforts are initiated.

Given the numerous factors that state agencies face in charting a course towards the effective use of data processing resources, any attempt to classify ACS systems must be viewed as a process of clarifying distinctions among the approaches and stages of system development, rather than as a "scoring" process aimed at identifying systems as "better or worse." Systems are implemented to respond to perceived needs, and they bring with them their own particular design problems and consequences. Very complex systems may demand the ongoing commitment of substantial resources for their maintenance, and still not manage to provide the types of support or control desired in a large agency. Simpler systems may provide the desired support and control in agencies with adequate staff resources and less volatile caseloads. Thus, in this section of the report, the distinctions that are drawn among systems should be viewed simply as an effort to distinguish among types of systems rather than to "score" Food Stamp Agencies.

Because systems differ along many dimensions, any effort to categorize them must inevitably focus on particular characteristics and other differences. In Section II, we presented a broad range of detailed characteristics of the 58 systems under study. In this section, we present a two-dimensional classification of automated certification systems, focusing on (1) the mode in which automated eligibility determination and benefit calculation functions are made available to eligibility staff, and (2) the degree of interaction between the eligibility staff and system functions. These two dimensions of the classification approach are explained in Section A. Section B then presents the results of the classification of states, and points out some of the ways in which particular states differ from the normal use patterns of the systems of other states in the same category, or exhibit specific features that make their assignment to a particular category a matter of judgment.

A. DIMENSIONS OF THE SCHEME FOR CLASSIFYING SYSTEMS

Two distinctions appear to capture to a large extent the variation in how eligibility systems are used in Food Stamp Agencies. First, we can distinguish the manner in which data supplied by applicants are used to determine eligibility and benefits and are recorded in a computerized data base. We will call this dimension of variation the "determination mode." Second, we can distinguish whether particular systems perform the processing required to determine eligibility and benefits and record data in case files, in response to batch processing jobs, on-line input by data entry staff, or interactive tasks initiated by the eligibility workers themselves. We will refer to this dimension as the "processing mode."

Determination Mode

The systems reviewed in the ACS census can be classified as falling into one of five determination modes:

1. Type 1: Basic Input and Recording. The system is not designed to perform any eligibility tests or benefit calculations. Eligibility workers perform these functions manually with worksheets, writing the necessary identifying case data and eligibility and benefit results on an input form, and submitting that form for entry into a computer file of those results.

2. Type 2: Manual Determination and Automated Results Checking. Some systems require that eligibility staff determine eligibility and benefits manually and input the results, but contain software to check those results. Such systems may perform all of the financial eligibility tests, compute net income and deductions, and compute allotments, but they are not relied on for such functions. In these systems, the eligibility worker completes an input form after having computed benefits, but will be alerted by the system if an error is made.

3. Type 3: Stand-Alone Eligibility and Benefit Determination. Some agencies have developed system components which help eligibility workers compute food stamp budgets (and perhaps perform basic eligibility tests), but have not provided a function which enables them to record automatically in the permanent certification data base either the results or the data that are input to use these functions. Consequently, in these systems, the

results obtained from the automated eligibility/benefit calculation function must be written onto an input form along with identifying information and the financial information already used in the stand-alone determination function.

- Type 4: Integrated Determination and Update From Input Form. These systems avoid the redundant entry of data by using input information not only to trigger the eligibility and benefit calculation process but also to update the permanent data base. Eligibility workers prepare input forms that contain basic identifying information and financial information. These input forms, once edited and found free of errors, are used as the basis for determining benefits and updating files. In most instances, the system generates a turnaround document that is used as the input form for the next change on the household record.

- Type 5: Application-Based Determination and Update. Some agencies have designed their data bases, calculation functions, and forms to eliminate the necessity of a special input form. Data are entered into the certification system directly from the application or recertification form completed by applicants. In most instances, eligibility staff add data in special "agency-reserved" fields, and may in fact record in such fields the results of intermediate manual calculations that in other agencies might be performed on a separate worksheet. Typically, however, no special worksheet need be completed, and no special input or turnaround form is prepared; the application form itself serves as the source document for data entry.

This dimension of the classification scheme attempts to capture the extent to which FSAs have been successful at reducing the complexity of the eligibility worker's task by (1) eliminating manual calculations and (2) reducing the number of documents that must be completed in the course of processing applications, recertifications, and changes, and transcribing information from one document to another. The differences among the five categories can be described in these terms.

Type 1 systems require that the worker perform all calculations and determinations manually, usually by

completing a worksheet from the application material, and then an input form based on worksheet results. Type 2 systems impose basically the same requirements, but provide some "back-up" for the worker by performing eligibility and benefit calculations to check the worker's input for errors.1/ Type 3 systems still require the worker to prepare an input form, but provide a system feature (usually accessible to the worker on-line) to perform the financial calculations required to compute benefits (and in some cases to apply basic financial eligibility tests). These systems typically require that the worker input financial data on household circumstances once to use the budgeting function, and that the worker or other staff input the data a second time to prepare an input form which records the household circumstances and financial results in the household record on the certification data base.

Type 4 systems eliminate this redundancy, linking the determination function with the file update; when data are entered to trigger the automated determination of eligibility and benefit amount, the data are saved and stored with the results of the determination on the household record.2/ Type 5 systems, in addition to linking the determination and update process, reduce the number of documents that must be completed, by providing a function for entering the data directly from the application form, rather than requiring that a special input form be prepared. The sophistication of the eligibility and benefit determination functions, however, may be comparable in Type 4 and 5 systems.

Processing Mode

The speed with which eligibility decisions can be reached, the results communicated to applicants, and benefits issued is an important concern to eligibility staff. They frequently work under time pressures to take action promptly, and often under the pressure imposed by applicants who are anxious to know

---

1/ Type 1 systems are also likely to perform some type of editing to check for arithmetic errors made by workers in their input, but Type 2 systems in this scheme are distinguished by the fact that they access tables or files in order to apply financial eligibility tests, derive income deductions, and compute allotments.

2/ In some instances, however, the data are saved on a household eligibility data base, and some form of command or approval must be entered to move the household data or key elements of the household record to the data base used for issuance purposes.

whether they will receive assistance, how much, and when. Therefore, another important dimension of system variation is the input/output path by which the eligibility worker submits transactions and learns or confirms the results of eligibility processing.

We distinguish three such paths, or processing modes, in our classification scheme: batch processing, on-line determination by data entry staff, and interactive determination by eligibility workers. In batch processing (Type A), eligibility and benefit results are computed and household records are updated from daily (usually nightly) runs which process all input forms submitted to the system during the day (or since the last processing run). Even in these batch systems, data entry and editing for input errors typically occur on-line (as we pointed out in Section II), so entry errors can be corrected quickly, but the computations required for eligibility testing and benefit determinations are not triggered until the initiation of regularly scheduled batch runs. Eligibility workers may obtain immediate feedback on errors they made in completing input forms if they are seated in close proximity to data entry staff; however, if the data entry staff are physically removed from eligibility staff, feedback on input form errors may be delayed until batches of input forms are returned to eligibility workers, or until edit reports are generated for the workers. Whether or not immediate feedback on input errors is available, however, once the input form is "clean" of errors the eligibility staff will not learn of the results of eligibility testing and benefit calculations until the batch run is completed, typically the next day.

In Type B "on-line determination" systems, data entry staff not only enter household information and correct entry errors on-line, but also trigger the system functions that compute eligibility and benefits. In these systems, the data entry staff who enter application, recertification, or interim change transactions can usually view the results immediately. The ability of eligibility workers to obtain rapid feedback on processing results will depend on such factors as the physical location of data entry staff relative to eligibility workers, agency procedures for defining the job responsibilities of data entry staff, and access by eligibility staff to terminals to perform the data entry

function themselves when circumstances require that they confirm eligibility and benefit results immediately.3/ Type C "interactive eligibility" systems may be technically similar to Type B systems, but differ in terms of how they are used. Household data are typically entered into these systems by the eligibility staff themselves, who thus obtain direct feedback on the eligibility and benefit results of the processing they initiate. A variety of methods may be used to trigger this processing and reporting of results. In some systems, the entire eligibility determination and benefit calculation may actually be performed while the eligibility worker waits at the terminal for the displayed results. In other agencies, concern about the processing load that may be imposed on the computer and the potential for lengthy response times has led to the development of methods for "background processing," in which the worker initiates the determination process and can then move on to other case files. The initiated determination is processed by the system when resources are available, and the results are then available in the household record for examination by the eligibility worker.

B. THE RESULTS OF THE SYSTEM CLASSIFICATION

Table III.1 arrays the 58 systems covered in the ACS census along the determination and processing dimensions. It must be noted, however, that this classification of systems is the product of an in-depth interpretation of the responses to census questions and the notes taken by census interviewers based on respondents' explanations of how their systems work. In some cases, despite careful probing by interviewers, some ambiguities or apparent inconsistencies remain in the recorded data which, in the interests of avoiding further burden on state agencies, we have attempted to resolve by interpreting the available notes. In other instances, state systems defy simple classification because they in fact comprise several different linked systems that support different aspects of certification work, with very different characteristics. The following discussion, organized by interpretation.

3/ Respondents in some agencies with Type B systems said that, at times, eligibility workers enter the data themselves so as to view eligibility and benefit results on-line. Systems were classified as Type B if the percentage of determinations performed on-line by eligibility workers was 25 percent or less (Qs 4.10 and 5.03).

TABLE III.1
CLASSIFICATION OF AUTOMATED
CERTIFICATION SYSTEMS

Determination Mode		Normal Processing Mode: Type A: Batch	Type B: On line Data Entry/Update	Type C: Interactive Determination by EW
Type 1:	Basic Input and recording	Arizona Hawaii Montana - Cascade Montana-Lewis & Clark Tennessee	California - San Bernardino (PA)	
Type 2:	Manual Determination & Automated Results Checking	Idaho Illinois/IPACS (ongoing) Indiana Kentucky Minnesota-Kandiyohi Missouri	Arkansas Ohio-Cuyahoga	
Type 3:	Stand Alone Eligibility and Benefit Determination	District of Columbia New Jersey Virgin Islands[a]	Michigan/LOA North Carolina	
Type 4:	Integrated Determination and update from Input Form	California-LA/IBPS California-Santa Clara/CSS Georgia Guam Iowa Kansas Massachusetts New Hampshire New Mexico Rhode Island Utah Virginia Washington Wyoming	Alabama Colorado Connecticut Delaware Florida Louisiana Maine Maryland Minnesota-Hennepin Nevada Ohio-Hamilton Oklahoma Pennsylvania (ongoing cases) South Carolina	Oregon
Type 5:	Application-Based Determination and Update		West Virginia Wisconsin	Alaska Illinois (AIS) (intake) Mississippi Nebraska New York New York City South Dakota Texas Vermont

[a] Manual Benefit Issuance

Table of Contents

Two systems are used in the District of Columbia--a PA system that supports food stamp and AFDC actions for PA households, and an NPA system. Census responses pertain to the NPA system, which requires that workers complete an input form after using the automated eligibility functions of the system.

Two systems are also used in Michigan. The Local Office Automation System provides on-line budgeting support for eligibility staff. However, once the worker completes the budgeting process, an input form must be prepared and entered into the Client Information System to trigger issuance.

Finally, it should be pointed out that the Virgin Islands has been categorized as Type 3, but the FSA there does not actually operate a system in the same sense as in other agencies. Microcomputers provide stand-alone budgeting support to eligibility workers, but because issuance is handled manually they do not provided a subsequent step for entering the results into a data base used for issuance. No permanent household data base is in use.

Type 4: Integrated Determination and Update from Input Form

Clarifications are also neccesary for a number of systems classified as Type 4. These clarifications are presented first for Type A systems, and then for Type B.

Type 4/Type A Systems. In California, both Los Angeles County and Santa Clara County use several systems. In LA County, three systems are used: the Welfare Case Management Information System (WCMIS) for case inquiries and clearance, the Integrated Benefit Payment System (IBPS) for eligibility determinations and benefit computations, and the LA County FS Automated Issuance and Reporting system (LAFAIR) for on-line issuance functions. LA County's classification as Type A is based on the IBPS, in which eligibility staff prepare input forms for batch processing, although inquiries and recording of issuances can be preformed on-line in the other two systems. Similarly, Santa Clara County uses two systems--an on-line issuance system (FAIR) and the Case Data System (CDS). The CDS, processing its input forms in batches, forms the basis for classifying Santa Clara as Type A.

The FMCS system in Massachusetts exhibits features of both Type 3 and Type 4. Eligibility workers can compute benefits on-line at intake and recertification using a "calculation screen" that does not update the household file; however, the census respondent reported that only 10 percent of all determinations are actually made this way because of the limited access to terminals. Massachusetts is classified as Type 4A because most transactions are performed with an input

form that triggers automated eligibility functions and updates the data base in batch.

The State of Washington's Client Financial System and Wyoming's Food Stamp Master File system are classified as Type 4 based on the fact that they determine benefit amounts and update household files. However, respondents in both states reported that their systems do not perform eligibility tests.

Type 4/Type B Systems. The classifications of four Type 4/Type B systems (Connecticut, Minnesota-Hennepin, Pennsylvania, and Oregon) require explanation.

In Connecticut, most data input is performed by data entry staff, but for the portion of the caseload that is subject to monthly reporting requirements, the eligibility workers themselves enter household transactions and carry out the system's eligibility and benefit calculation functions. Since this comprises only about 8 percent of the caseload, Connecticut's system is still classified as Type B.

Minnesota-Hennepin County's Economic Assistance System can perform on-line eligibility tests and benefit calculations, and agency managers intend for these functions to be used directly by eligibility staff. However, staff reportedly distrust the system, and perform manual calculations and prepare input forms for entry by data entry clerks. The system is classified as Type B, although the agency's intent is to have eligibility workers use the system directly (Type C).

Pennsylvania's food stamp system functions differently for intake and ongoing transactions. At intake, workers use a stand-alone "calculator" function to determine benefits, and must then enter the results into the main system. For ongoing households, however, input forms trigger eligibility and benefit determinations and file updates. Pennsylvania's classification is based on the description of ongoing processing.

Oregon is the only agency we identified in which eligibility workers complete standard input forms, and then enter the data themselves rather than turn the forms over to a data entry staff. The Oregon respondent reported that data entry staff used to enter input forms, but it was decided that it was more efficient for workers to interact directly with the system.

Type 5: Application-Based Determination and Update

Although 11 agencies reported using systems in which data are entered directly from application forms, only 8 distinct systems actually exist, since Alaska and Mississippi use the same system, Vermont and South Dakota use the same system, and New York State and City are using systems developed with virtually the same features. Of these 8 systems, those of West Virginia and New York require some comment.

The West Virginia system uses the application as an input form, but the eligibility worker makes extensive entries on sections of the application form which amount to a worksheet. Whereas most of the Type 5 systems capture more "raw" data and perform more data preparation functions than do Type 4 systems, this does not appear to be true in West Virginia.

Finally, it should be pointed out that in New York State the eligibility determinations are performed interactively by eligibility workers, justifying a Type C classification. However, updating the files used for issuance is a separate function that is triggered when eligibility processing is completed but is actually performed in batch runs.

Table of Contents

The pattern of system characteristics and types reported in Sections II and III is not at all static. Most states maintain developmental staffs who continually work at planning and implementing improvements in their systems or acquiring or developing completely new systems. This section presents information about the types of changes that will be made in the near future in FSA certification systems. Section A first describes the current plans for systems changes reported by agency respondents in the census interviews. Section B then offers some comments on the apparent trends in system use.

A. ANTICIPATED SYSTEM CHANGES

As shown in Table IV.1, major changes in certification systems are anticipated and scheduled in 45 of the 58 agencies covered in the ACS census.1/ According to the plans described by respondents in answering Question 14.04, 36 of these 45 enhancement plans will be accomplished by the end of 1987. Although only brief descriptions of enhancement plans were provided in the census interviews, we can point out 7 areas of system changes or improvements that were described to the census interviewers:

- The adoption or development of completely new certification systems
- The increased automation of eligibility determination and benefit calculation functions
- The expanded production of notices to households or reports
- Increased on-line access to system functions

1/Table A.1 in Appendix A shows 44 entries with scheduled dates of enhancement and 14 with no scheduled dates of enhancement. Mississippi was included among those without a scheduled improvement because it has no current plan for upgrading beyond the major new system implementation now under way. However, the new system of Mississippi is included in the discussion here as an enchancement to provide a complete picture of new system development activities.

TABLE IV.1

SUMMARY OF SYSTEM ENCHANCEMENT PLANS

Agency	Enchancement Date	New System	Increased Automation of Elig./Benefit	Notices/ Reports	On-line Access	Interfaces/ Verification/ Matching	History/ Data Base	Program Integration
Alabama	09/86		X					
Arizona	12/86	X (A)	X	X	X	?	X	X
Arkansas	05/87					X	X	
California-LA	06/88		X					
California-Santa Clara	01/87					X		
California-San Bernardino	04/87		X					
Colorado	10/87			X				
Connecticut	07/87	X	X	X	X	?	X	X
Delaware	10/86					X		
Washington, D.C.	10/87	no information on planned system changes						
Florida	DK/87	X	X					
Georgia	01/87				X			
Hawaii	07/88	X (A)	X	X	X	?	X	X
Idaho	10/86	X	X		X			
Indiana	06/87		X				X	
Iowa	DK/87					X		
Kansas	07/87	X (A)	X	X	X	?	X	X
Kentucky	DK/87		X					
Louisiana	09/86				X		X	
Maine	09/86			X				
Maryland	10/86						X	
Michigan	DK/88		X		X			
Minnesota-Hennepin	08/86			X				

NOTE: (A) indicates adoption of Alaska EIS

TABLE IV.1 (Continued)

Agency	Enchancement Date	New System	Increased Automation of Elig./Benefit	Notices/ Reports	On-line Access	Interfaces/ Verification/ Matching	History/ Data Base	Program Integration
Minnesota-Kandiyohi	07/87				X			
Mississippi	08/87	X (A)	X X	X	?	X	X	
Missouri	12/88		X	X				
Nevada	07/87		X			X		
New Hamsphire	12/88			X				
New Jersey	03/87	no information on system changes						
New Mexico	12/86	X					X	
New York City	12/86[a]		X					
Ohio-Cuyahoga	12/87					X		
Oklahoma	07/87						X	
Oregon	11/87						X	
Pennsylvania	02/87						X	
South Carolina	08/88						X	
South Dakota	10/86				X			
Tennessee	11/86		X			X		
Texas	09/87			X				
Utah	10/87	X (A)	? X	X	?	X		
Washington	06/87	X no information on planned features						
Wisconsin	01/88		X	X				
Wyoming	10/86	X (A)	X X	X	?	X	X	
Guam	09/86			X				
Virgin Islands	10/88	X no information on planned features						

NOTE: (A) indicates adoption of Alaska EIS

[a] New York City reported functional enhancements going on at the same time as implementation of WMS (to be completed 1/87).

- The implementation of improved methods of verification, matching, or interfaces with other program data bases
- The expanded storage of and access to historical data and/or more detailed data base content
- The integration of functions between food stamps and other programs

These system enchancement plans are described in the following sections and are summarized in Table IV.1. In some instances, individual states are mentioned more than once, because their description of enhancement plans included several types of feature upgrades. For agencies in which far-reaching changes are planned (e.g., new systems), some attempt has been made to infer from a description of the new system and information on the system currently in use which categories of enhancement will actually be due to the global change described in the interview.2/

Adoption of New Certification Systems

Eleven agencies reported that they will soon implement completely new certification systems. The most striking aspect of these reports is that five of the new systems implemented (in Arizona, Hawaii, Utah, Kansas, and Wyoming) will be adopted from the Alaska/North Dakota "Eligibility Information System," which is already operating in those two states and being implemented in Mississippi. By the end of 1987, a total of 8 states will thus be using virtually identical integrated systems to support food stamps and AFDC eligibility processing and case management. It should be pointed out that adopting systems from other agencies is not an entirely new practice. As indicated in Table IV.2, the systems described in the census interviews include 15 that had been adopted from the systems of other Food Stamp Agencies.

Six other agencies reported plans to implement new systems, but did not provide enough information to clarify whether they were developing their own systems or planning to adopt a system from another agency. Florida intends to implement a

---

2/In Table IV.1, a "?" is entered where we cannot reasonably infer whether a new feature or new system will lead to an enhancement of a particular type.

TABLE IV.2

PAST SYSTEM ADOPTIONS

Agency	Source of System
Alabama	New Mexico
Arizona	Utah
Colorado	New Mexico
Florida	Unknown
Hawaii	Oklahoma
Minnesota (Kandiyohi)	Minnesota (Another County)
Mississippi[a]	North Dakota
New Jersey	Oklahoma
New Mexico	Louisiana
New York (NYC)	New York (Upstate)
North Carolina	New Mexico
Ohio (Cuyahoga)	Mississippi
South Carolina	Alambama
South Dakota	Vermont
Utah	Maine

[a] Although this system was orginally developed in Alaska, Mississippi describes its system plan as an adoption of the system running in North Dakota, which was based on the Alaska EIS.

"FAMIS system" in 1987, and the Virgin Islands is "looking at FAMIS" as a basis for a new system. Idaho plans to implement a new system that will incorporate on-line edits and inquiry, batch eligibility processing, and the direct use of terminals by eligibility workers for input. New Mexico reported that it will introduce a new integrated system by the end of 1986, and Washington reports that it will implement a new system called COSMOS in 1987. Connecticut reports that it will implement a system "like the North Dakota and New Mexico systems," to be provided by an outside contractor.

Increased Automation of Eligibility/ Benefit Determination

Eighteen agencies plan to improve the capabilities of their systems for automated eligibility determinations and benefit calculations. The implementation of completely new systems will have the effect of enhancing this capability in Arizona, Connecticut, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Kansas, Mississippi, and Wyoming.3/ Ten other agencies will enhance their current system capabilities. Alabama reported simply that the entire state would adopt an "income eligibility system," but the significance of this change is unclear. Los Angeles and San Bernardino counties in California also reported that they will improve this capability--LA by making an unspecified enhancement to existing automated eligibility functions, and San Bernardino by introducing automated processing for NPA households. Indiana and Kentucky plan to implement a greater number of eligibility calculation functions, and Michigan will introduce a totally on-line eligibility system called ASSIST. Missouri will introduce on-line eligibility and benefit calculation, and Nevada plans to add a capability for performing combined prospective and retrospective budgeting calculations. Tennessee will introduce automated eligibility processing as the second implementation phase of TWISS, and Wisconsin will restructure its existing eligibility processing program to add new features.

Notices and Reports

Eleven agencies will improve the capacity of their systems to generate notices to households or internal reports. Of these 11, 7 are agencies that will be implementing totally new systems (and for which the inclusion of enhanced notice functions is inferred from the brief overall description of the new system and census information on its predecessor). In

---

3/In New Mexico, Utah, and the Virgin Islands, the interview descriptions of planned changes do not make clear whether the new systems will have the effect of enhancing this function.

addition, 4 other agencies will add notice or report features. Colorado will enhance its ability to produce notices in conjunction with its increasingly automated monthly reporting functions. Maine and Minnesota-Hennepin will improve its notification features, and New York City reports that it will improve its ability to generate internal system reports.

On-Line Access

The adoption of 8 of the 10 planned new systems will introduce or expand on-line access to system functions; 8 more agencies plan other changes to improve on-line access. Georgia plans to enhance access to terminals by eligibility workers, aiming for a ratio of 4 workers per terminal. Louisiana will make historical data available on-line to workers for the first time. The ASSIST system of Michigan will increase the use of on-line eligibility processing. Missouri will introduce on-line eligibility and benefit processing for the first time, and New Hampshire will expand on-line access to eligibility processing to all districts.

Texas will continue its current stage of system implementation by expanding to the entire state the capability of transmitting eligibility and benefit results directly from local office microcomputers to the state's central data base without the necessity of completing an intermediate input form. In Wisconsin, all eligibility workers will have their own terminals; system question prompts will enable them to enter data during interviews, and the system will print out a hard copy of the application for their signatures. Guam will introduce on-line processing, but it is not clear in what form.

Interfaces, Verification, and Matching

Four agencies specifically reported that their capabilities to access other program data bases will be improved in the near future. Arkansas will implement interfaces to AFDC and SSA files. Santa Clara County in California reported that it will gain access to a central statewide food stamp data base, which will enable workers to check for duplicate participation in other counties.4/ Delaware will implement a capability for direct updates of SSI and SSA benefits received by food stamp household members. South Dakota reports that it will

---

4/It was not clear from the Santa Clara respondent what data base would provide this information.

implement features to comply with regulations on Integrated Eligibility Verification Systems in terms of matches with other program data bases.

Household Histories and Data Base Detail

In addition to the 7 agencies that will implement new systems and whose system descriptions provide a basis for anticipating major data base changes, 7 other agencies specifically mentioned enhancements that will affect their data bases. Arkansas will expand the amount of information on individual household members which is stored in its data base, and Indiana reported that it will implement a "new data base" with more detailed household data, as well as more extensive data edits. Louisiana, as we mentioned previously, will make historical data available to workers. Maryland and Ohio-Cuyahoga will include data on individual household members in their data bases for the first time. Nevada will "add more history on income and expenses," but the significance of that change is not clear. Finally, Tennessee, as part of its TWISS implementation, will add claims data and claims tracking, and information on disqualification status, to its data base.

Program Integration Features

Seven of the agencies that will implement new systems provided enough information to make clear that these systems will enhance their capacity to integrate food stamp/AFDC processing. Four other agencies mentioned specific enhancements that will affect program integration. Oklahoma reported that it will bring all SSI, AFDC, and NPA/food stamp cases onto its system, and Oregon that it will bring "all programs" on-line. Pennsylvania reported that it will integrate the data bases for its cash, medical, and food stamp programs. South Carolina will also introduce integrated AFDC/food stamp processing (which will probably also entail changes to the agency's data base, although that was not mentioned specifically).

B. TRENDS IN SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT

If the planned changes described in Section A are implemented successfully, the pattern of system use described in Section III will be altered quite dramatically within a few years. In this section, we point out three salient features of the set of changes anticipated.

Availability of Automated Eligibility Processing

With the set of anticipated changes described above, system capabilities for eligibility determination and benefit calculation will be nearly universal at the state agency level. All of the state systems now classified as Type 1A (Basic Input and Recording, in Batch Mode) will have moved out of that category--Arizona and Hawaii by adopting the Alaska system, and Tennessee by moving into the second phase of its TWISS implementation. Idaho will have implemented a new system with on-line entry and automated batch eligibility determination, and Kentucky and Missouri will have some form of automated determination. Indiana will implement some improvement in its eligibility calculation function. In addition to these state changes, San Bernadino County in California will implement automated budgeting for NPA households.

The net effect of these changes, if carried out as planned, is that only 2 of the 9 state systems now classified as Type 1 or 2 will remain. Based on information provided in the census interview, Illinois will still require ongoing workers to determine eligibility and benefits manually for system input and checking, although a highly automated set of system functions is in place for intake. In Arkansas, manual determinations will continue to be necessary, although important enhancements in other aspects of the system will be implemented, as we pointed out previously.

Direct Upgrades from Batch to Interactive Systems

A striking feature of the system changes soon to be undertaken is the extent to which Food Stamp Agencies that, up to now, have had limited capabilities for automated eligibility processing, on-line processing, or both are now finding it possible to "leapfrog" over stages of system development by taking advantage of the more recent technological and the developmental experience of other agencies. In Figure III.1, this leap-frogging is indicated by the number of agencies which will soon move from Type 1 classification to Type 5, or Type A to Type C, due largely to the increasing use of the Alaska system. Arizona and Hawaii will move from Type 1-A to Type 5-A, and Kansas, Utah, and Wyoming from Type 4-A to 5-C. Agencies that are already using on-line processing based on input forms have obviously expended considerable resources to at be the forefront of developing on-line entry/update systems. Based on descriptions of their current plans, they appear unlikely in the near future to shift to the more interactive approach in which eligibility staff themselves use the system to carry out household transactions.

Another way to view this trend is that older certification systems, generally developed with earlier software development methods and data base technology, appear most likely to be replaced with entirely new systems, and it is the introduction of entirely new systems which appears most likely to move an agency into Type 5C system use. Of the 11 agencies which reported that they are planning to implement entirely new systems, 73 percent (8 agencies) have been operating with systems implemented before 1980, whereas only 22 of the 58 current systems overall (or 38 percent) were implemented before 1980. Eight of these 22 older systems will be replaced by new systems in the next two years.

Data Entry by Eligibility Workers

As implied above, one consequence of recent developments in certification systems is an increased reliance on eligibility workers themselves to enter household data into the systems as they process applications, recertifications, and interim changes interactively at system terminals. At the time of the census interviews, 10 agencies relied primarily on the direct entry of transactions by eligibility workers (including the Illinois intake system and the Mississippi system soon to be implemented). As shown in Figure III.1, an obvious link exists between relying on eligibility workers to enter their own transactions and designing application forms that can be used directly for data entry, without having to prepare a special input form or complete a worksheet. Oregon, however, has decided to have eligibility workers enter their own transactions even though they must still prepare special input forms, apparently judging that there are advantages to direct feedback on errors and eligibility results, and that the delay and cost of a separate data entry process are not necessary.

With the system changes now scheduled, the direct entry of household transactions by eligibility workers will be expanded further. The 5 agencies planning to adopt the Alaska system will be added to Type 5C--Arizona, Hawaii, Kansas, Utah, and Wyoming. In addition, Idaho, although its eligibility processing will reportedly still be performed in batch, will have eligibility workers perform their own transaction entry at terminals during household interviews. In Georgia, which already has a capability to perform on-line eligibility processing, eligibility workers now perform only a very small percentage of on-line eligibility transactions themselves because not enough terminals are available to them. However, if adequate funds are available, Georgia plans to acquire more terminals in eligibility staff units, to reach a ratio of four

workers to each terminal, and to expand the direct use of the system by workers. Several other agencies may also be moving in this direction, but the plans described in the census interviews did not explicitly point this out. At a minimum, however, the number of Type C systems can be expected to increase in the next two years from 10 to 17.

Table of Contents

APPENDIX A

DETAILED AGENCY TABLES

Table of Contents

TABLE A.1
SYSTEM HISTORY AND SOURCE

JURISDICTION	PRIMARY SYSTEMS[a] (1.01)	DATE OF FIRST IMPLEMENTATION (1.02)	PERCENT OF CASELOAD SERVED (1.03)	OTHER STATE SYSTEM SOURCE (14.03)	DATE OF NEXT ENHANCEMENT (14.04)
ALABAMA	SCI-II	07/81	100	NM	09/86
ALASKA	ELIG INFO SYSTEM	11/83	100	.	99/99
ARIZONA	ASSIST PROG INFO SYSTEM	03/79	100	UT	12/86
ARKANSAS	FS ON-LINE SYSTEM	08/81	100	.	05/87
CALIF-LOS ANGELES	INTEGR BEN PAY SYS (IBPS)[b]	06/85	100	.	06/88
CALIF-SANTA CLARA	CASE DATA SYSTEM[c]	DK/65	100	.	01/87
CALIF-SAN BERNADINO	MACHINE BUDGETTING	07/84	100	.	04/87
COLORADO	CO AUTO FS SYSTEM	09/82	92	NM	10/87
CONNECTICUT	CASELOAD ELIG MGT SYS (CLEM)	07/83	100	.	07/87
DELAWARE	DE CLIENT INFO SYSTEM	03/84	100	.	10/86
WASHINGTON,D.C.	(UNNAMED)	10/80	100	.	10/87
FLORIDA	FS INFO SYSTEM	11/76	100	DK	DK/87
GEORGIA	PA REP & INFO SYS (PARIS)	04/84	100	.	01/87
HAWAII	PUBLIC WELFARE SYSTEM	07/74	100	OK	07/88
IDAHO	400 SYSTEM	07/72	100	.	10/86
ILLINOIS	IPACS (AIS)[d]	DK/66	100	.	99/99
INDIANA	(UNNAMED)	12/74	DK	.	06/87
IOWA	AUTOMATED BENEFIT CALC	06/84	100	.	DK/87
KANSAS	(UNNAMED)	07/79	100	.	07/87
KENTUCKY	FS2.1	09/77	100	.	DK/87
LOUISIANA	FS MGT INFORMATION SYSTEM	03/79	100	.	09/86
MAINE	HUMAN SRV INTEGR ON-LINE SYS	04/83	100	.	09/86
MARYLAND	AUT INC MAINT SYSTEM (AIMS)	10/84	100	.	10/86
MASSACHUSETTS	FMCS	10/81	100	.	99/99
MICHIGAN	LOCAL OFFICE AUTOM (LOA)[e]	07/84	100	.	DK/88
MINNESOTA-HENNEPIN	ECON ASST SYSTEM (EAS)	10/82	100	.	08/86
MINNESOTA-KANDIYOHI	CARLTON SYSTEM	03/82	45	99	07/87
MISSISSIPPI	MAVERICS	08/87[f]	100	ND	99/99
MISSOURI	(UNNAMED)	05/82	100	.	12/88
MONTANA-CASCADE	SYSTEM 38	07/82	100	.	99/99
MONTANA-LEWIS+CLARK	LEWIS+CLARK CTY SYSTEM	05/83	100	.	99/99

NOTE: "DK MEANS DATA NOT AVAILABLE AT TIME OF INTERVIEW
"." MEANS NOT APPLICABLE
"99/99" MEANS NO DATE SET FOR ENHANCEMENTS OR NO ENHANCEMENTS PLANNED
"99" MEANS THAT SOURCE IS ANOTHER COUNTY AGENCY IN THE SAME STATE

TABLE A.1
SYSTEM HISTORY AND SOURCE

JURISDICTION	PRIMARY SYSTEMS[a] (1.01)	DATE OF FIRST IMPLEMENTATION (1.02)	PERCENT OF CASELOAD SERVED (1.03)	OTHER STATE SYSTEM SOURCE (14.03)	DATE OF NEXT ENHANCEMENT (14.04)
NEBRASKA	NE FS AUTO SYSTEM	07/85	100	.	99/99
NEVADA	(UNNAMED)	06/79	100	.	07/87
NEW HAMPSHIRE	ELIGIBILITY MGT SYSTEM	05/78	100	.	12/88
NEW JERSEY	CODES	06/81	100	OK	03/87
NEW MEXICO	FOOD STAMP SYSTEM	08/80	100	LA	12/86
NEW YORK-UPSTATE	WELFARE MGT SYSTEM (WMS)	DK/83	100	.	99/99
NEW YORK-NYC	WELFARE MGT SYSTEM (WMS)	01/87[f]	100	NY	12/86
NORTH CAROLINA	FS INFO SYSTEM	05/83	100	NM	99/99
OHIO-CUYAHOGA	(UNNAMED)	09/70	100	MI	12/87
OHIO-HAMILTON	HAMILTON CTY SYSTEM	06/70	100	.	99/99
OKLAHOMA	CASE INFO SYSTEM (CI)	01/72	100	.	07/87
OREGON	FS MGT INFO SYSTEM	07/76	100	.	11/87
PENNSYLVANIA	FS STAND-ALONE SYS	03/80	100	.	02/87
RHODE ISLAND	(UNNAMED)	06/79	100	.	99/99
SOUTH CAROLINA	STATE/COUNTY INTEG DB (SID-III)	10/84	100	AL	08/88
SOUTH DAKOTA	ACCESS	11/85	100	VT	10/86
TENNESSEE	TEN WELF INTEG SERV SYS (TWISS)	DK/76	100	.	11/86
TEXAS	WELNET	03/84	50	.	09/87
UTAH	CASE INFO SYSTEM (CIS)	08/72	100	ME	10/87
VERMONT	ACCESS	09/83	100	.	99/99
VIRGINIA	VA CLIENT INFO SYS (VACIS)	09/85	3	.	99/99
WASHINGTON	CLIENT FINANCIAL	07/68	100	.	06/87
WEST VIRGINIA	C-219 SYSTEM	06/71	100	.	99/99
WISCONSIN	COMPUTER REPT NETWORK (CRN)	12/79	100	.	01/88
WYOMING	FS MASTERFILE	DK/66	100	.	10/86
GUAM	FS CERTIFICATION SYSTEM	03/81	85	.	09/86
VIRGIN ISLANDS	(UNNAMED)	07/84	100	.	10/88

[a]System names are abbreviated.

[b]Related systems are LAFAIR and WEMIS.

[c]Related system is FAIR.

[d]Data presented in Tables A.10 and A.11 refer to AIS. Both are treated as distinct systems in system classification. Implementation date is for IPACS.

[e]Related system is CIS.

Table of Contents

TABLE A.2
PROCESSING HARDWARE AND TERMINAL USAGE

JURISDICTION	CENTRAL PROCESSING HARDWARE (14.00A)	LOCAL PROCESSING HARDWARE (14.00B)	NUMBER OF ELIGIBILITY WORKERS PER TERMINAL (10.02)
ALABAMA	IBM	NO	6.0
ALASKA	IBM	OTH	1.0
ARIZONA	OTH	NO	1.0
ARKANSAS	IBM	NO	1.7
CALIF-LOS ANGELES	IBM	S/U	DK
CALIF-SANTA CLARA	IBM	NO	30.0
CALIF-SAN BERNADINO	IBM	NO	12.0
DELAWARE	IBM	NO	3.0
WASHINGTON,D.C.	IBM	NO	4.4
FLORIDA	BUR	NO	DK
GEORGIA	IBM	IBM	DK
HAWAII	IBM	NO	DK
IDAHO	IBM	NO	4.0
ILLINOIS	IBM	OTH	100.0
INDIANA	IBM	NO	DK
IOWA	IBM	NO	5.7
KANSAS	IBM	NO	DK
KENTUCKY	IBM	NO	DK
LOUISIANA	IBM	IBM	7.7
MAINE	HON	NO	3.5
MARYLAND	IBM	NO	DK

TABLE A.2
PROCESSING HARDWARE AND TERMINAL USAGE

JURISDICTION	CENTRAL PROCESSING HARDWARE (14.00A)	LOCAL PROCESSING HARDWARE (14.00B)	NUMBER OF ELIGIBILITY WORKERS PER TERMINAL (10.02)
NEBRASKA	IBM	NO	1.0
NEVADA	IBM	OTH	4.4
NEW HAMPSHIRE	HON	NO	3.8
NEW JERSEY	HON	NO	10.0
NEW MEXICO	IBM	IBM	1.5
NEW YORK-UPSTATE	S/U	OTH	5.0
NEW YORK-NYC	S/U	OTH	5.0
NORTH CAROLINA	IBM	NO	5.9
OHIO-CUYAHOGA	IBM	NO	DK
OHIO-HAMILTON	IBM	NO	12.5
OKLAHOMA	IBM	NO	6.0
OREGON	IBM	NO	5.0
PENNSYLVANIA	S/U	NO	6.0
RHODE ISLAND	IBM	NO	5.0
SOUTH CAROLINA	IBM	IBM	10.0
SOUTH DAKOTA	IBM	IBM	1.0
TENNESSEE	AMD	NO	14.1
TEXAS	S/U	IBM	1.0
UTAH	IBM	NO	4.0
VERMONT	IBM	NO	1.0
VIRGINIA	S/U	NO	6.0
WASHINGTON	S/U	NO	15.0
WEST VIRGINIA	IBM	NO	18.5
WISCONSIN	IBM	NO	12.0
WYOMING	IBM	NO	DK
GUAM	IBM	NO	DK
VIRGIN ISLANDS	NO	IBM	5.0

NOTE: HARDWARE ABBREVIATIONS:
BUR=BURROUGHS DIG=DIGITAL(DEC) S/U=SPERRY/UNIVAC HON=HONEYWELL CD=CONTROL DATA
AMD=AMDAHL OTH=OTHER MANUFACTURER NO=NO HARDWARE OF THIS TYPE
"DK" MEANS DATA NOT AVAILABLE AT TIME OF INTERVIEW
"." MEANS NOT APPLICABLE

Table of Contents

TABLE A.3
1985 STAFFING RATES AND SALARIES

JURISDICTION	NUMBER OF FTE ELIGIBILITY WORKERS (13.02A)	NUMBER OF ELIGIBILITY WORKERS PER SUPERVISOR (13.02A/B)	NUMBER OF ELIGIBILITY WORKERS PER CLERICAL SUPPORT WORKER (13.02A/C)	AVERAGE ELIGIBILITY WORKER ANNUAL SALARY($) (13.03)	FRINGE RATE (%) (13.04)
ALABAMA	456	9.9	1.9	16,594	27
ALASKA	22	4.4	2.2	29,120	23
ARIZONA	278	6.0	1.2	15,939	24
ARKANSAS	288	7.0	1.6	16,614	24
CALIF-LOS ANGELES	431	6.5	DK	19,722	34
CALIF-SANTA CLARA	119	6.6	5.4	23,928	35
CALIF-SAN BERNADINO	DK	DK	DK	17,405	20
COLORADO	500	12.5	500.0	15,000	25
CONNECTICUT	DK	DK	DK	19,677	37
DELAWARE	187	8.1	5.7	17,500	29
WASHINGTON,D.C.	85	4.3	4.3	21,000	10
FLORIDA	1,081	6.0	3.1	13,096	27
GEORGIA	918	7.0	7.5	15,168	29
HAWAII	DK	DK	DK	19,560	33
IDAHO	52	4.0	4.0	18,500	18
ILLINOIS	877	DK	2.0	19,657	11
INDIANA	492	7.1	1.9	17,185	26
IOWA	664	DK	DK	16,256	20
KANSAS	82	4.8	DK	20,252	15
KENTUCKY	1,327	9.6	2.8	17,829	18
LOUISIANA	1,020	7.6	2.0	12,036	13
MAINE	165	8.7	2.4	15,371	25
MARYLAND	1,384	7.0	2.7	14,800	28
MASSACHUSETTS	395	4.5	DK	18,435	24
MICHIGAN	451	6.0	1.3	22,100	33
MINNESOTA-HENNEPIN	183	6.8	DK	17,456	25
MINNESOTA-KANDIYOHI	3	3.0	3.0	13,884	17
MISSISSIPPI	950	3.2	1.9	12,000	18
MISSOURI	736	6.4	3.0	14,448	23
MONTANA-CASCADE	21	7.0	1.8	16,825	20
MONTANA-LEWIS+CLARK	12	6.0	1.5	15,373	22

TABLE A.3
1985 STAFFING RATES AND SALARIES

JURISDICTION	NUMBER OF FTE ELIGIBILITY WORKERS (13.02A)	NUMBER OF ELIGIBILITY WORKERS PER SUPERVISOR (13.02A/B)	NUMBER OF ELIGIBILITY WORKERS PER CLERICAL SUPPORT WORKER (13.02A/C)	AVERAGE ELIGIBILITY WORKER ANNUAL SALARY($) (13.03)	FRINGE RATE (%) (13.04)
NEBRASKA	DK	DK	DK	17,663	18
NEVADA	71	8.9	2.8	22,865	24
NEW HAMPSHIRE	34	5.7	2.0	15,300	20
NEW JERSEY	746	2.3	.8	20,000	10
NEW MEXICO	166	6.6	12.8	15,937	25
NEW YORK-UPSTATE	DK	DK	DK	DK	DK
NEW YORK-NYC	DK	DK	DK	DK	DK
NORTH CAROLINA	2,000	DK	DK	16,000	27
OHIO-CUYAHOGA	210	4.9	2.8	18,140	27
OHIO-HAMILTON	39	5.6	DK	15,608	27
OKLAHOMA	141	4.9	4.1	15,042	28
OREGON	DK	DK	DK	DK	DK
PENNSYLVANIA	DK	DK	DK	20,000	36
RHODE ISLAND	45	9.0	1.2	19,004	29
SOUTH CAROLINA	590	8.7	2.9	14,500	21
SOUTH DAKOTA	97	5.7	3.9	15,149	16
TENNESSEE	860	5.4	4.2	14,858	24
TEXAS	1,331	8.0	1.6	20,052	21
UTAH	62	4.4	3.4	21,100	33
VERMONT	40	6.7	4.0	16,100	25
VIRGINIA	664	8.4	3.0	15,690	23
WASHINGTON	DK	DK	DK	DK	DK
WEST VIRGINIA	564	5.2	3.9	13,932	28
WISCONSIN	DK	DK	DK	DK	DK
WYOMING	100	6.7	3.3	18,000	16
GUAM	18	4.5	9.0	13,000	DK
VIRGIN ISLANDS	31	7.8	4.4	9,672	17

NOTE: "DK" MEANS DATA NOT AVAILABLE AT TIME OF INTERVIEW

Table of Contents

TABLE A.4
1985 TRANSACTION VOLUME

JURISDICTION	MONTHLY CASELOAD (13.01)	TOTAL APPLICATIONS PROCESSED (13.05A)	TOTAL EXPEDITED SERVICE APPLICATIONS PROCESSED (13.05B)	TOTAL RECERTIFICATIONS PROCESSED (13.05C)	TOTAL INTERIM ACTIONS PROCESSED (13.05D)
NEBRASKA	38,000	DK	DK	DK	DK
NEVADA	15,518	42,839	9,799	30,398	140,522
NEW HAMPSHIRE	12,124	23,362	DK	DK	DK
NEW JERSEY	170,421	DK	DK	DK	DK
NEW MEXICO	49,332	103,589	300	40,755	399,743
NEW YORK-UPSTATE	260,442	DK	DK	DK	DK
NEW YORK-NYC	476,599	DK	DK	DK	DK
NORTH CAROLINA	175,000	140,000	DK	276,000	450,000
OHIO-CUYAHOGA	93,187	68,320	DK	180,658	DK
OHIO-HAMILTON	38,799	91,763	11,467	46,868	DK
OKLAHOMA	99,887	DK	DK	DK	DK
OREGON	DK	DK	DK	DK	DK
PENNSYLVANIA	410,000	341,650	DK	162,977	DK
RHODE ISLAND	28,000	51,676	5,289	19,268	15,495
SOUTH CAROLINA	124,732	328,315	16,415	122,447	50,934
SOUTH DAKOTA	15,939	38,126	DK	DK	DK
TENNESSEE	188,508	203,936	49,775	372,626	DK
TEXAS	397,572	436,561	132,000	423,391	1,054,671
UTAH	25,000	25,456	11,356	DK	DK
VERMONT	17,338	17,865	DK	DK	DK
VIRGINIA	135,873	154,053	DK	218,403	DK
WASHINGTON	DK	DK	DK	DK	DK
WEST VIRGINIA	125,989	125,260	DK	DK	DK
WISCONSIN	DK	DK	DK	DK	DK
WYOMING	10,500	DK	DK	DK	DK
GUAM	4,500	800	150	9,600	26,000
VIRGIN ISLANDS	9,000	30,000	3,000	26,500	6,000

NOTE: "DK" MEANS DATA NOT AVAILABLE AT TIME OF INTERVIEW

Table of Contents

TABLE A.4
1985 TRANSACTION VOLUME

JURISDICTION	MONTHLY CASELOAD (13.01)	TOTAL APPLICATIONS PROCESSED (13.05A)	TOTAL EXPEDITED SERVICE APPLICATIONS PROCESSED (13.05B)	TOTAL RECERTIFICATIONS PROCESSED (13.05C)	TOTAL INTERIM ACTIONS PROCESSED (13.05D)
ALABAMA	220,000	484,893	DK	383,363	214,709
ALASKA	6,000	15,900	DK	DK	DK
ARIZONA	66,187	232,322	24,910	166,413	290,856
ARKANSAS	80,637	157,516	DK	100,537	DK
CALIF-LOS ANGELES	201,717	DK	DK	165,153	DK
CALIF-SANTA CLARA	15,734	29,243	DK	13,212	DK
CALIF-SAN BERNADINO	28,721	38,114	8,535	16,206	DK
COLORADO	65,000	224,000	67,200	135,000	DK
CONNECTICUT	52,500	40,930	DK	120,500	DK
DELAWARE	15,000	7,200	DK	DK	150,000
WASHINGTON,D.C.	30,000	66,325	14,032	6,464	38,199
FLORIDA	32,450	712,116	66,024	314,736	700,296
GEORGIA	178,167	215,732	21,445	283,512	1,195,013
HAWAII	97,261	26,836	DK	5,285	DK
IDAHO	21,000	41,000	DK	14,800	110,000
ILLINOIS	430,100	343,369	57,110	DK	DK
INDIANA	129,696	143,845	DK	169,405	872,660
IOWA	75,298	DK	DK	DK	DK
KANSAS	45,772	95,436	3,486	56,900	134,892
KENTUCKY	188,778	174,439	43,488	378,636	327,840
LOUISIANA	210,427	192,910	DK	294,576	565,200
MAINE	44,000	33,324	10,596	39,960	67,656
MARYLAND	114,933	DK	DK	DK	DK
MASSACHUSETTS	135,864	DK	DK	DK	DK
MICHIGAN	390,000	401,761	16,482	329,479	DK
MINNESOTA-HENNEPIN	25,975	DK	DK	DK	DK
MINNESOTA-KANDIYOHI	1,000	1,766	300	592	4,800
MISSISSIPPI	170,000	120,159	DK	178,093	DK
MISSOURI	139,117	255,755	DK	213,219	900,789
MONTANA-CASCADE	2,600	DK	DK	DK	DK
MONTANA-LEWIS+CLARK	15,000	DK	DK	DK	DK

TABLE A.5
1985 APPROVALS AND TERMINATIONS

JURISDICTION	PERCENT APPLICATIONS APPROVED (13.06)	PERCENT RECERTIFICATIONS APPROVED (13.07)	TOTAL TERMINATIONS (13.08)	PERCENT TERMINATED DUE TO NOSHOW (13.09)
ALABAMA	69	87	34,709	25
ALASKA	DK	DK	DK	DK
ARIZONA	DK	DK	DK	DK
ARKANSAS	74	88	49,061	0
CALIF-LOS ANGELES	37	91	90,439	DK
CALIF-SANTA CLARA	61	98	29,208	6
CALIF-SAN BERNADINO	64	99	29,709	0
COLORADO	90	79	62,550	37
CONNECTICUT	67	70	DK	DK
DELAWARE	67	DK	DK	DK
WASHINGTON,D.C.	94	DK	12,771	10
FLORIDA	66	88	540,948	DK
GEORGIA	66	95	101,280	DK
HAWAII	69	DK	20,255	DK
IDAHO	50	DK	16,000	25
ILLINOIS	66	DK	290,000	DK
INDIANA	51	DK	85,420	DK
IOWA	DK	DK	DK	DK
KANSAS	50	91	38,896	0
KENTUCKY	8	15	66,142	5
LOUISIANA	72	83	119,592	DK
MAINE	83	90	36,912	1
MARYLAND	DK	DK	DK	DK
MASSACHUSETTS	DK	DK	DK	DK
MICHIGAN	70	99	DK	DK
MINNESOTA-HENNEPIN	DK	DK	46,556	DK
MINNESOTA-KANDIYOHI	66	96	1,260	10
MISSISSIPPI	41	64	DK	DK
MISSOURI	73	88	91,008	DK
MONTANA-CASCADE	DK	DK	DK	DK
MONTANA-LEWIS+CLARK	DK	DK	DK	DK

TABLE A.5
1985 APPROVALS AND TERMINATIONS

JURISDICTION	PERCENT APPLICATIONS APPROVED (13.06)	PERCENT RECERTIFICATIONS APPROVED (13.07)	TOTAL TERMINATIONS (13.08)	PERCENT TERMINATED DUE TO NOSHOW (13.09)
NEBRASKA	DK	DK	DK	DK
NEVADA	DK	DK	42,877	DK
NEW HAMPSHIRE	31	DK	18,498	61
NEW JERSEY	DK	DK	DK	DK
NEW MEXICO	63	37	15,100	1
NEW YORK-UPSTATE	DK	DK	DK	DK
NEW YORK-NYC	DK	DK	DK	DK
NORTH CAROLINA	60	90	DK	DK
OHIO-CUYAHOGA	DK	DK	DK	DK
OHIO-HAMILTON	DK	DK	DK	DK
OKLAHOMA	DK	DK	DK	DK
OREGON	DK	DK	DK	DK
PENNSYLVANIA	71	86	DK	DK
RHODE ISLAND	75	60	DK	29
SOUTH CAROLINA	84	84	32,747	2
SOUTH DAKOTA	DK	DK	DK	DK
TENNESSEE	70	DK	140,000	56
TEXAS	67	70	450,000	2
UTAH	DK	DK	DK	DK
VERMONT	DK	DK	14,616	34
VIRGINIA	71	87	153,054	DK
WASHINGTON	DK	DK	DK	DK
WEST VIRGINIA	78	DK	73,114	DK
WISCONSIN	DK	DK	DK	DK
WYOMING	DK	DK	12,000	DK
GUAM	99	99	1,062	DK
VIRGIN ISLANDS	DK	DK	DK	DK

NOTE: "DK" MEANS DATA NOT AVAILABLE AT TIME OF INTERVIEW

Table of Contents

TABLE A.6
HOUSEHOLD DATA AVAILABLE ON DATABASE

JURISDICTION	GROSS EARNINGS (3.04)	SELF EMPLOYMENT INCOME (3.05)	UNEARNED INCOME (3.06)	NUMBER OF UNEARNED INCOME CATEGORIES (3.07)	HOUSING COSTS (3.08)	UTILITY COSTS (3.13)	MEDICAL EXPENSES (3.15)	DEPENDENT CARE (3.16)	RESOURCES (3.18)
ALABAMA	2	2	3	24	2	1	1	1	1
ALASKA	2	2	3	25	1	1	2	1	3
ARIZONA	1	0	2	7	0	0	1	1	0
ARKANSAS	2	0	3	4	2	1	1	1	2
CALIF-LOS ANGELES	2	1	3	19	2	1	2	1	0
CALIF-SANTA CLARA	1	2	2	10	2	1	1	1	2
CALIF-SAN BERNADINO	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	2
COLORADO	2	1	3	13	2	1	1	1	0
CONNECTICUT	1	0	2	11	2	1	1	1	0
DELAWARE	2	2	3	25	2	2	2	1	3
WASHINGTON,D.C.	1	0	2	20	2	1	1	1	0
FLORIDA	2	1	3	26	2	1	1	1	1
GEORGIA	2	2	3	22	1	1	2	1	3
HAWAII	2	0	3	7	2	2	1	1	3
IDAHO	1	0	2	3	1	1	1	1	0
ILLINOIS	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
INDIANA	1	0	1	1	2	1	1	1	0
IOWA	2	1	3	13	2	1	1	1	0
KANSAS	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0
KENTUCKY	1	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0
LOUISIANA	2	1	3	17	2	1	1	1	0
MAINE	2	0	3	7	2	1	1	1	0
MARYLAND	1	0	2	4	2	1	1	1	1
MASSACHUSETTS	1	0	1	1	2	2	1	1	0
MICHIGAN	2	2	3	6	2	1	1	1	1
MINNESOTA-HENNEPIN	1	1	2	6	2	1	1	1	0
MINNESOTA-KANDIYOHI	2	1	2	13	2	1	1	1	3
MISSISSIPPI	2	2	3	10	2	1	2	1	3
MISSOURI	2	1	3	7	0	0	1	1	1
MONTANA-CASCADE	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
MONTANA-LEWIS+CLARK	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE A.6
HOUSEHOLD DATA AVAILABLE ON DATABASE

JURISDICTION	GROSS EARNINGS (3.04)	SELF EMPLOYMENT INCOME (3.05)	UNEARNED INCOME (3.06)	NUMBER OF UNEARNED INCOME CATEGORIES (3.07)	HOUSING COSTS (3.08)	UTILITY COSTS (3.13)	MEDICAL EXPENSES (3.15)	DEPENDENT CARE (3.16)	RESOURCES (3.18)
NEBRASKA	2	2	3	26	2	1	2	1	2
NEVADA	2	0	3	10	2	1	2	1	0
NEW HAMPSHIRE	2	1	3	49	2	1	2	1	2
NEW JERSEY	1	0	2	7	0	0	1	1	0
NEW MEXICO	1	1	3	19	1	1	1	1	0
NEW YORK-UPSTATE	2	1	2	55	2	2	1	1	0
NEW YORK-NYC	2	2	3	50	2	2	2	1	0
NORTH CAROLINA	2	1	3	14	2	1	1	1	1
OHIO-CUYAHOGA	2	1	3	23	2	1	0	1	0
OHIO-HAMILTON	1	0	2	6	2	2	1	1	0
OKLAHOMA	2	2	3	21	2	1	1	1	1
OREGON	2	1	3	22	2	1	1	1	1
PENNSYLVANIA	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0
RHODE ISLAND	2	1	3	19	2	1	1	1	0
SOUTH CAROLINA	2	1	3	15	2	1	1	1	1
SOUTH DAKOTA	2	2	3	25	2	1	2	1	3
TENNESSEE	1	0	2	15	2	0	1	1	0
TEXAS	2	2	3	10	1	1	2	1	2
UTAH	1	1	2	8	1	1	1	1	1
VERMONT	2	2	3	18	2	1	2	1	3
VIRGINIA	2	1	3	33	2	1	2	1	2
WASHINGTON	1	2	2	50	2	1	0	0	0
WEST VIRGINIA	1	0	3	6	2	2	1	0	0
WISCONSIN	2	2	3	33	2	2	2	1	3
WYOMING	1	1	2	10	1	1	0	1	0
GUAM	2	1	3	21	2	2	1	1	1
VIRGIN ISLANDS	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0

NOTE: AN ENTRY OF "0" ON THIS TABLE IMPLIES THE DATA ITEM DOES NOT EXIST ON THE STATE'S DATABASE.
OTHER TABLE ENTRIES REFLECT INTERVIEW CODING SCHEMES AS FOLLOWS:

- GROSS EARNINGS 1=TOTAL HOUSEHOLD, 2=BY INDIVIDUAL
- SELF-EMPLOYMENT INCOME 1=NET ONLY, 2=INCOME AND ALLOWABLE EXPENSE
- UNEARNED INCOME 1=TOTAL HOUSEHOLD, 2=TOTAL HOUSEHOLD BY INCOME CATEGORY, 3=BY INCOME CATEGORY AND INDIVIDUAL
- HOUSING COSTS 1=IF EXCESS SHELTER COST, 2=ALWAYS
- UTILITY COSTS 1=IF GREATER THAN STANDARD, 2=ALWAYS
- MEDICAL EXPENSES 1=TOTAL HOUSEHOLD, 2=BY INDIVIDUAL
- DEPENDENT CARE 1=AS REPORTED
- RESOURCES 1=TOTAL COUNTABLE VALUE, 2=COUNTABLE VALUE BY TYPE, 3=REPORTED VALUE BY TYPE PLUS OTHER FACTORS

TABLE A.7
HISTORICAL DATA AVAILABLE ON DATABASE

JURISDICTION	SCOPE OF HISTORICAL DATA ON CURRENT DATABASE (7.11)	LENGTH OF CURRENT DATABASE HISTORY (7.13)	SCOPE OF ARCHIVAL DATA (7.15)	ARCHIVE LENGTH (7.17)	ACCESSIBLE HARD COPY HISTORY (8.02)	ACCESSIBLE ON-LINE HISTORY (8.06)
ALABAMA	0	.	2	36 MONTHS	36 MONTHS	NONE
ALASKA	1	99 MONTHS	0	.	99 MONTHS	99 MONTHS
ARIZONA	0	.	0	.	00 MONTHS	NONE
ARKANSAS	1	48 ACTIONS	2	99 MONTHS	NONE	48 ACTIONS
CALIF-LOS ANGELES	2	24 MONTHS	0	.	24 MONTHS	NONE
CALIF-SANTA CLARA	1	12 MONTHS	0	.	12 MONTHS	06 MONTHS
CALIF-SAN BERNADINO	2	60 MONTHS	0	.	60 MONTHS	60 MONTHS
COLORADO	0	.	0	.	00 MONTHS	NONE
CONNECTICUT	1	04 MONTHS	0	.	NONE	04 MONTHS
DELAWARE	1	99 MONTHS	0	.	NONE	99 MONTHS
WASHINGTON,D.C.	0	.	0	.	NONE	NONE
FLORIDA	1	02 MONTHS	0	.	NONE	02 MONTHS
GEORGIA	1	13 MONTHS	0	.	13 MONTHS	NONE
HAWAII	0	.	0	.	NONE	NONE
IDAHO	0	.	2	84 MONTHS	84 MONTHS	NONE
ILLINOIS	1	23 MONTHS	2	99 MONTHS	99 MONTHS	24 ACTIONS
INDIANA	0	.	0	.	NONE	NONE
IOWA	1	12 MONTHS	0	.	12 MONTHS	12 MONTHS
KANSAS	0	.	0	.	NONE	NONE
KENTUCKY	2	01 ACTIONS	0	.	01 ACTIONS	01 ACTIONS
LOUISIANA	0	.	0	.	NONE	NONE
MAINE	1	36 MONTHS	0	.	36 MONTHS	36 MONTHS
MARYLAND	2	12 ACTIONS	0	.	12 MONTHS	NONE
MASSACHUSETTS	0	.	0	.	NONE	NONE
MICHIGAN	1	12 ACTIONS	0	.	NONE	12 ACTIONS
MINNESOTA-HENNEPIN	1	99 MONTHS	2	99 MONTHS	99 MONTHS	99 MONTHS
MINNESOTA-KANDIYOHI	1	48 MONTHS	0	.	48 MONTHS	NONE
MISSISSIPPI	2	12 MONTHS	2	36 MONTHS	36 MONTHS	12 MONTHS
MISSOURI	1	12 MONTHS	1	24 MONTHS	36 MONTHS	12 MONTHS
MONTANA-CASCADE	1	99 MONTHS	0	.	99 MONTHS	99 MONTHS
MONTANA-LEWIS+CLARK	2	36 MONTHS	0	.	36 MONTHS	36 MONTHS

TABLE A.7
HISTORICAL DATA AVAILABLE ON DATABASE

JURISDICTION	SCOPE OF HISTORICAL DATA ON CURRENT DATABASE (7.11)	LENGTH OF CURRENT DATABASE HISTORY (7.13)	SCOPE OF ARCHIVAL DATA (7.15)	ARCHIVE LENGTH (7.17)	ACCESSIBLE HARD COPY HISTORY (8.02)	ACCESSIBLE ON-LINE HISTORY (8.06)
NEBRASKA	2	36 MONTHS	0	.	36 MONTHS	36 MONTHS
NEVADA	2	18 ACTIONS	1	36 MONTHS	18 ACTIONS	18 ACTIONS
NEW HAMPSHIRE	1	03 MONTHS	1	99 MONTHS	99 MONTHS	03 MONTHS
NEW JERSEY	1	12 MONTHS	0	.	12 MONTHS	12 MONTHS
NEW MEXICO	0	.	2	36 MONTHS	36 MONTHS	NONE
NEW YORK-UPSTATE	1	99 MONTHS	1	12 MONTHS	99 MONTHS	99 MONTHS
NEW YORK-NYC	2	06 MONTHS	2	99 MONTHS	99 MONTHS	99 MONTHS
NORTH CAROLINA	0	.	0	.	NONE	NONE
OHIO-CUYAHOGA	0	.	1	06 MONTHS	06 MONTHS	NONE
OHIO-HAMILTON	1	06 MONTHS	1	60 MONTHS	66 MONTHS	06 MONTHS
OKLAHOMA	1	60 MONTHS	0	.	60 MONTHS	60 MONTHS
OREGON	2	05 MONTHS	0	.	05 MONTHS	05 MONTHS
PENNSYLVANIA	1	02 MONTHS	2	99 MONTHS	99 MONTHS	02 MONTHS
RHODE ISLAND	0	.	0	.	NONE	NONE
SOUTH CAROLINA	1	36 MONTHS	0	.	36 MONTHS	36 MONTHS
SOUTH DAKOTA	2	99 MONTHS	0	.	99 MONTHS	99 MONTHS
TENNESSEE	1	12 MONTHS	0	.	NONE	12 MONTHS
TEXAS	0	.	1	24 MONTHS	24 MONTHS	24 MONTHS
UTAH	1	01 ACTIONS	0	.	01 ACTIONS	NONE
VERMONT	2	40 MONTHS	0	.	40 MONTHS	40 MONTHS
VIRGINIA	2	17 MONTHS	0	.	17 MONTHS	17 MONTHS
WASHINGTON	2	99 MONTHS	0	.	99 MONTHS	99 MONTHS
WEST VIRGINIA	0	.	0	.	NONE	NONE
WISCONSIN	0	.	2	99 MONTHS	99 MONTHS	NONE
WYOMING	0	.	0	.	NONE	NONE
GUAM	0	.	2	99 MONTHS	99 MONTHS	NONE
VIRGIN ISLANDS	0	.	0	.	NONE	NONE

NOTE: SCOPE OF HISTORICAL DATA ON CURRENT DATABASE, SCOPE OF ARCHIVAL DATA
0=NO HISTORICAL DATA MAINTAINED, 1=ABBREVIATED FORMAT, 2=SAME AS CURRENT
"99" MEANS NOT LIMITED TO ANY SPECIFIC LENGTH
"." MEANS NOT APPLICABLE

Table of Contents

TABLE A.8
SYSTEM INPUT AND PROCESSING MODE

JURISDICTION	AUTOMATED ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION? (4.00)	AUTOMATED BENEFIT CALCULATION? (5.00)	USE OF TERMINALS DURING INTERVIEW (2.01)	PRIMARY INPUT SOURCE (6.08)	USE OF WORKSHEETS (% OF APPLICATIONS) (6.09)	AVAILABILITY OF ON-LINE EDIT RESULTS (9.00)	UPDATE MODE (9.01)	PERCENT OF ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION DONE ON-LINE (4.10)	PERCENT OF BENEFIT CALCULATIONS DONE ON-LINE (5.03)
ALABAMA	YES	YES	NO	1	0	2	ON-LINE	0	0
ALASKA	YES	YES	BOTH	4	0	2	ON-LINE	99	100
ARIZONA	NO	NO	NO	1	100	1	BATCH	0	0
ARKANSAS	PARTIAL	PARTIAL	NO	1	100	1	ON-LINE	0	0
CALIF-LOS ANGELES	YES	YES	NO	1	25	1	MIXED	0	0
CALIF-SANTA CLARA	YES	YES	NO	1	2	2	MIXED	0	0
CALIF-SAN BERNADINO	NO	YES	NO	1	100	2	ON-LINE	0	0
COLORADO	YES	YES	NO	2	100	1	ON-LINE	25	25
CONNECTICUT	YES	YES	NO	1	0	1	MIXED	8	8
DELAWARE	YES	YES	NO	1	0	2	ON-LINE	0	0
WASHINGTON,D.C.	YES	YES	NO	1	70	0	BATCH	10	10
FLORIDA	YES	YES	NO	1	100	2	ON-LINE	0	0
GEORGIA	YES	YES	NO	1	0	1	BATCH	1	1
HAWAII	NO	NO	NO	1	100	2	BATCH	0	0
IDAHO	NO	PARTIAL	NO	1	100	1	BATCH	0	0
ILLINOIS	YES	YES	INTAKE	3	0	2	BATCH	90	90
INDIANA	PARTIAL	PARTIAL	NO	2	100	1	BATCH	0	0
IOWA	YES	YES	NO	1	2	1	BATCH	0	0
KANSAS	YES	YES	NO	1	100	0	BATCH	0	0
KENTUCKY	NO	PARTIAL	BOTH	1	100	0	BATCH	0	0
LOUISIANA	YES	YES	NO	1	100	1	MIXED	0	0
MAINE	YES	YES	NO	1	100	2	ON-LINE	100	100
MARYLAND	YES	YES	NO	2	100	2	ON-LINE	1	0
MASSACHUSETTS	PARTIAL	YES	NO	1	100	1	BATCH	0	10
MICHIGAN	YES	YES	NO	3	2	2	ON-LINE	95	100
MINNESOTA-HENNEPIN	YES	YES	RECERT	2	100	2	ON-LINE	7	DK
MINNESOTA-KANDIYOHI	PARTIAL	PARTIAL	NO	2	100	1	BATCH	0	0
MISSISSIPPI	YES	YES	BOTH	3	1	2	ON-LINE	100	100
MISSOURI	PARTIAL	PARTIAL	NO	1	100	1	BATCH	0	0
MONTANA-CASCADE	NO	NO	NO	2	100	0	BATCH	0	0
MONTANA-LEWIS+CLARK	NO	NO	NO	1	100	1	BATCH	0	0

TABLE A.8
SYSTEM INPUT AND PROCESSING MODE

JURISDICTION	AUTOMATED ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION? (4.00)	AUTOMATED BENEFIT CALCULATION? (5.00) (2.01)	USE OF TERMINALS DURING INTERVIEW (6.09)	PRIMARY INPUT SOURCE (6.08)	USE OF WORKSHEETS (% OF APPLICATIONS) (4.10)	AVAILABILITY OF ON-LINE EDIT RESULTS (9.00) (5.03)	UPDATE MODE (9.01)	PERCENT OF ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION DONE ON-LINE	PERCENT OF BENEFIT CALCULATIONS DONE ON-LINE
NEBRASKA	YES	YES	BOTH	4	0	1	ON-LINE	100	100
NEVADA	YES	YES	NO	1	4	2	ON-LINE	0	0
NEW HAMPSHIRE	YES	YES	NO	1	7	1	BATCH	0	0
NEW JERSEY	YES	YES	NO	1	100	0	BATCH	100	100
NEW MEXICO	YES	YES	NO	1	0	1	BATCH	5	5
NEW YORK-UPSTATE	YES	YES	BOTH	4	0	2	BATCH	100	100
NEW YORK-NYC	YES	YES	BOTH	4	0	2	BATCH	100	100
NORTH CAROLINA	YES	YES	NO	1	0	2	ON-LINE	DK	DK
OHIO-CUYAHOGA	PARTIAL	PARTIAL	NO	2	100	2	ON-LINE	0	0
OHIO-HAMILTON	YES	YES	NO	2	100	2	ON-LINE	10	12
OKLAHOMA	YES	YES	NO	1	1	1	ON-LINE	0	0
OREGON	YES	YES	NO	2	100	2	ON-LINE	99	99
PENNSYLVANIA	PARTIAL	YES	NO	1	100	2	ON-LINE	0	0
RHODE ISLAND	YES	YES	NO	3	95	1	BATCH	0	0
SOUTH CAROLINA	YES	YES	BOTH	1	0	2	ON-LINE	100	100
SOUTH DAKOTA	YES	YES	NO	3	0	1	BATCH	10	10
TENNESSEE	NO	NO	NO	1	100	1	MIXED	0	0
TEXAS	YES	YES	BOTH	4	0	2	BATCH	100	100
UTAH	YES	YES	NO	1	100	1	BATCH	0	0
VERMONT	YES	YES	NO	3	1	2	ON-LINE	10	10
VIRGINIA	YES	YES	NO	1	100	2	BATCH	0	0
WASHINGTON	NO	YES	NO	1	100	1	BATCH	0	0
WEST VIRGINIA	YES	YES	NO	3	75	1	ON-LINE	0	0
WISCONSIN	YES	YES	NO	3	0	2	ON-LINE	0	0
WYOMING	NO	YES	NO	2	10	0	BATCH	0	0
GUAM	YES	YES	NO	1	100	0	BATCH	0	0
VIRGIN ISLANDS	YES	YES	NO	4	100	1	.	DK	DK

NOTE: PRIMARY INPUT SOURCE
1=INPUT FORM, 2=INPUT FORM/WORKSHEET
3=APPLICATION FORM WITH WORKER INPUT, 4=APPLICATION FORM
AVAILABILTY OF ON-LINE EDIT RESULTS
0=NONE, 1=INTERNAL CONSISTENCY AND RANGE EDITS
2=INTERNAL EDITS AND EDITS AGAINST DATABASE
"DK" MEANS DATA NOT AVAILABLE AT TIME OF INTERVIEW
"." MEANS NOT APPLICABLE

Table of Contents

TABLE A.9
INTEGRATION OF FOOD STAMP WORKERS AND SYSTEM WITH AFDC PROGRAM

JURISDICTION	USE OF GENERIC WORKERS (12.00)	COMBINED APPLICATION FORM AFDC/FS (12.01)	COMBINED INPUT FORM (12.02)	COMMON INPUT DATA ENTERED ONCE (12.03)	COMBINED CASELOAD REPORTS (12.04)
ALABAMA	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO
ALASKA	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
ARIZONA	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES
ARKANSAS	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
CALIF-LOS ANGELES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
CALIF-SANTA CLARA	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
CALIF-SAN BERNADINO	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES
COLORADO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
CONNECTICUT	YES	DK	NO	NO	NO
DELAWARE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
WASHINGTON,D.C.	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO
FLORIDA	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
GEORGIA	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
HAWAII	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
IDAHO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
ILLINOIS	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
INDIANA	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
IOWA	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
KANSAS	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
KENTUCKY	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
LOUISIANA	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO
MAINE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
MARYLAND	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO
MASSACHUSETTS	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
MICHIGAN	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES
MINNESOTA-HENNEPIN	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES
MINNESOTA-KANDIYOHI	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
MISSISSIPPI	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
MISSOURI	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO
MONTANA-CASCADE	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
MONTANA-LEWIS+CLARK	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO

TABLE A.9
INTEGRATION OF FOOD STAMP WORKERS AND SYSTEM WITH AFDC PROGRAM

JURISDICTION	USE OF GENERIC WORKERS (12.00)	COMBINED APPLICATION FORM AFDC/FS (12.01)	COMBINED INPUT FORM (12.02)	COMMON INPUT DATA ENTERED ONCE (12.03)	COMBINED CASELOAD REPORTS (12.04)
NEBRASKA	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO
NEVADA	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
NEW HAMPSHIRE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
NEW JERSEY	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
NEW MEXICO	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES
NEW YORK-UPSTATE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
NEW YORK-NYC	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
NORTH CAROLINA	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
OHIO-CUYAHOGA	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES
OHIO-HAMILTON	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
OKLAHOMA	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
OREGON	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO
PENNSYLVANIA	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO
RHODE ISLAND	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
SOUTH CAROLINA	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO
SOUTH DAKOTA	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
TENNESSEE	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO
TEXAS	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
UTAH	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
VERMONT	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
VIRGINIA	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
WASHINGTON	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
WEST VIRGINIA	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
WISCONSIN	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
WYOMING	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO
GUAM	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
VIRGIN ISLANDS	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

NOTE: "DK" MEANS DATA NOT AVAILABLE AT TIME OF INTERVIEW

TABLE A.10
ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION AND BENEFIT CALCULATION

JURISDICTION	INDIVIDUAL ELIGIBILITY TESTS (4.04)	GROSS INCOME TEST (4.05A)	NET INCOME TEST (4.05B)	RESOURCE TEST (4.05C)	BASIC ALLOTMENT CALCULATION (5.01B)	PRORATION (5.01C)	RECOUPMENT (5.01D)
ALABAMA	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
ALASKA	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
ARIZONA	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
ARKANSAS	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
CALIF-LOS ANGELES	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
CALIF-SANTA CLARA	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
CALIF-SAN BERNADINO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
COLORADO	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
CONNECTICUT	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
DELAWARE	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
WASHINGTON,D.C.	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
FLORIDA	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
GEORGIA	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
HAWAII	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
IDAHO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES
ILLINOIS	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
INDIANA	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO
IOWA	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
KANSAS	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
KENTUCKY	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES
LOUISIANA	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
MAINE	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
MARYLAND	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
MASSACHUSETTS	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
MICHIGAN	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
MINNESOTA-HENNEPIN	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
MINNESOTA-KANDIYOHI	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
MISSISSIPPI	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
MISSOURI	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
MONTANA-CASCADE	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
MONTANA-LEWIS+CLARK	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

Table of Contents

TABLE A.10
ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION AND BENEFIT CALCULATION

JURISDICTION	INDIVIDUAL ELIGIBILITY TESTS (4.04)	GROSS INCOME TEST (4.05A)	NET INCOME TEST (4.05B)	RESOURCE TEST (4.05C)	BASIC ALLOTMENT CALCULATION (5.01B)	PRORATION (5.01C)	RECOUPMENT (5.01D)
NEBRASKA	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
NEVADA	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
NEW HAMPSHIRE	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
NEW JERSEY	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
NEW MEXICO	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
NEW YORK-UPSTATE	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
NEW YORK-NYC	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
NORTH CAROLINA	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
OHIO-CUYAHOGA	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO
OHIO-HAMILTON	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
OKLAHOMA	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
OREGON	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
PENNSYLVANIA	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
RHODE ISLAND	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
SOUTH CAROLINA	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
SOUTH DAKOTA	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
TENNESSEE	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
TEXAS	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
UTAH	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
VERMONT	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
VIRGINIA	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
WASHINGTON	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES
WEST VIRGINIA	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
WISCONSIN	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
WYOMING	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO
GUAM	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
VIRGIN ISLANDS	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO

TABLE A.11
PREPARATION OF DATA FOR ELIGIBILITY AND BENEFIT CALCULATION

JURISDICTION	NET INCOME CALCULATION (4.02A)	COUNTABLE RESOURCE CALCULATION (4.02B)	EXCESS SHELTER DEDUCTION (4.02C)	SYSTEM ACCESS TO BENEFIT INCOME FROM OTHER PROGRAMS (6.07)
ALABAMA	YES	NO	YES	NONE
ALASKA	YES	YES	YES	A,B,C
ARIZONA	NO	NO	NO	NONE
ARKANSAS	YES	NO	YES	, ,C
CALIF-LOS ANGELES	YES	NO	YES	A, ,
CALIF-SANTA CLARA	YES	NO	YES	A,B,C
CALIF-SAN BERNADINO	NO	NO	NO	NONE
COLORADO	YES	NO	YES	NONE
CONNECTICUT	YES	NO	YES	NONE
DELAWARE	YES	YES	YES	A,B,
WASHINGTON,D.C.	YES	NO	YES	NONE
FLORIDA	YES	NO	YES	NONE
GEORGIA	YES	YES	YES	A, ,C
HAWAII	NO	NO	NO	NONE
IDAHO	NO	NO	NO	A, ,C
ILLINOIS	YES	YES	YES	NONE
INDIANA	YES	NO	YES	NONE
IOWA	YES	NO	YES	A, ,C
KANSAS	YES	NO	YES	NONE
KENTUCKY	NO	NO	NO	NONE
LOUISIANA	YES	NO	YES	NONE
MAINE	YES	NO	YES	A, ,
MARYLAND	YES	NO	YES	A,B,C
MASSACHUSETTS	YES	NO	YES	A, ,C
MICHIGAN	YES	NO	YES	A,B,
MINNESOTA-HENNEPIN	YES	NO	YES	A,B,C
MINNESOTA-KANDIYOHI	YES	YES	YES	NONE
MISSISSIPPI	YES	YES	YES	A, ,
MISSOURI	YES	NO	YES	NONE
MONTANA-CASCADE	NO	NO	NO	NONE
MONTANA-LEWIS+CLARK	NO	NO	NO	NONE

TABLE A.11
PREPARATION OF DATA FOR ELIGIBILITY AND BENEFIT CALCULATION

JURISDICTION	NET INCOME CALCULATION (4.02A)	COUNTABLE RESOURCE CALCULATION (4.02B)	EXCESS SHELTER DEDUCTION (4.02C)	SYSTEM ACCESS TO BENEFIT INCOME FROM OTHER PROGRAMS (6.07)
NEBRASKA	YES	YES	YES	A, ,C
NEVADA	YES	NO	YES	NONE
NEW HAMPSHIRE	YES	NO	YES	A, ,C
NEW JERSEY	YES	NO	YES	A, ,
NEW MEXICO	YES	NO	YES	A,B,C
NEW YORK-UPSTATE	YES	NO	YES	A,B,C
NEW YORK-NYC	YES	NO	YES	A,B,
NORTH CAROLINA	YES	NO	YES	NONE
OHIO-CUYAHOGA	YES	NO	YES	NONE
OHIO-HAMILTON	YES	NO	YES	NONE
OKLAHOMA	YES	NO	YES	NONE
OREGON	YES	NO	YES	A,B,C
PENNSYLVANIA	YES	NO	YES	NONE
RHODE ISLAND	YES	NO	YES	A, ,C
SOUTH CAROLINA	YES	NO	YES	NONE
SOUTH DAKOTA	YES	YES	YES	A, ,C
TENNESSEE	NO	NO	NO	NONE
TEXAS	YES	NO	YES	A, ,
UTAH	YES	NO	YES	A,B,C
VERMONT	YES	YES	YES	A, ,
VIRGINIA	YES	NO	YES	NONE
WASHINGTON	NO	NO	NO	NONE
WEST VIRGINIA	YES	NO	YES	A, ,
WISCONSIN	YES	YES	YES	A, ,
WYOMING	NO	NO	NO	NONE
GUAM	YES	NO	YES	NONE
VIRGIN ISLANDS	YES	NO	YES	NONE

NOTE: SYSTEM ACCESS TO BENEFIT INCOME
A=AFDC, B=GA, C=OTHER

TABLE A.12
OTHER SYSTEM ELIGIBILITY AND BENEFIT CALCULATION FUNCTIONS

JURISDICTION	WORKERS ABILITY TO OVERRRIDE THE SYSTEMS ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION/ BENEFIT CALCULATION (4.06,6.01)	APPROVAL NEEDED TO TRIGGER ISSUANCE (6.04)	PERCENTAGE OF CASES REQUIRING WORKER APPROVAL (6.05)	AUTOMATIC RETENTION OF BENEFIT CALCULATION RESULTS (6.03)	ON-LINE INQUIRY TO CURRENT DATA AND HISTORY (8.04,8.05)
ALABAMA	2	NO	.	YES	1
ALASKA	3	YA	.	YES	2
ARIZONA	.	.	.	.	1
ARKANSAS	0	NO	.	YES	2
CALIF-LOS ANGELES	2	NO	.	YES	0
CALIF-SANTA CLARA	3	NO	.	YES	2
CALIF-SAN BERNADINO	0	NO	.	YES	2
COLORADO	0	NO	.	YES	1
CONNECTICUT	0	YS	8	YES	2
DELAWARE	3	NO	.	YES	2
WASHINGTON,D.C.	0	.	.	NO	0
FLORIDA	0	NO	.	YES	2
GEORGIA	0	NO	.	YES	1
HAWAII	.	.	.	.	1
IDAHO	0	NO	.	YES	1
ILLINOIS	0	NO	.	YES	2
INDIANA	3	NO	.	YES	1
IOWA	2	NO	.	YES	2
KANSAS	0	NO	.	YES	0
KENTUCKY	0	NO	.	YES	2
LOUISIANA	0	NO	.	YES	1
MAINE	3	NO	.	YES	2
MARYLAND	3	NO	.	YES	0
MASSACHUSETTS	0	NO	.	YES	1
MICHIGAN	0	.	.	NO	2
MINNESOTA-HENNEPIN	0	NO	.	YES	2
MINNESOTA-KANDIYOHI	0	NO	.	YES	1
MISSISSIPPI	0	YA	.	YES	2
MISSOURI	0	NO	.	YES	2
MONTANA-CASCADE	.	.	.	.	2
MONTANA-LEWIS+CLARK	.	.	.	.	2

TABLE A.12
OTHER SYSTEM ELIGIBILITY AND BENEFIT CALCULATION FUNCTIONS

JURISDICTION	WORKERS ABILITY TO OVERRRIDE THE SYSTEMS ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION/ BENEFIT CALCULATION (4.06,6.01)	APPROVAL NEEDED TO TRIGGER ISSUANCE (6.04)	PERCENTAGE OF CASES REQUIRING WORKER APPROVAL (6.05)	AUTOMATIC RETENTION OF BENEFIT CALCULATION RESULTS (6.03)	ON-LINE INQUIRY TO CURRENT DATA AND HISTORY (8.04,8.05)
NEBRASKA	0	NO	.	YES	2
NEVADA	0	NO	.	YES	2
NEW HAMPSHIRE	1	NO	.	YES	2
NEW JERSEY	0	.	.	NO	2
NEW MEXICO	0	NO	.	YES	1
NEW YORK-UPSTATE	3	YA	.	YES	2
NEW YORK-NYC	0	YA	.	YES	2
NORTH CAROLINA	0	.	.	NO	1
OHIO-CUYAHOGA	0	NO	.	YES	0
OHIO-HAMILTON	0	YA	.	YES	2
OKLAHOMA	0	NO	.	YES	2
OREGON	1	NO	.	YES	2
PENNSYLVANIA	2	NO	.	YES	2
RHODE ISLAND	0	NO	.	YES	1
SOUTH CAROLINA	0	.	.	NO	2
SOUTH DAKOTA	3	YA	.	YES	2
TENNESSEE	.	.	.	.	2
TEXAS	2	YA	.	YES	2
UTAH	2	NO	.	YES	1
VERMONT	3	YA	.	YES	2
VIRGINIA	0	.	.	NO	2
WASHINGTON	2	NO	.	YES	2
WEST VIRGINIA	0	NO	.	YES	0
WISCONSIN	3	NO	.	YES	1
WYOMING	0	NO	.	YES	0
GUAM	0	NO	.	YES	0
VIRGIN ISLANDS	.	.	.	.	0

NOTE: WORKERS ABILITY TO OVERRIDE THE SYSTEM
0=NO OVERRIDE, 1=ELIGIBILITY ONLY, 2=BENEFIT ONLY, 3=BOTH
APPROVAL NEEDED TO TRIGGER ISSUANCE
YS=YES,SOMETIMES, YA=YES,ALWAYS
ON-LINE INQUIRY
0=NO ON-LINE INQUIRY, 1=ONLY CURRENT STATUS ON-LINE, 2=HISTORY AND CURRENT STATUS ON-LINE
"." MEANS NOT APPLICABLE

Table of Contents

TABLE A.13
CASE MANAGEMENT CONTROLS AND FLAGS

JURISDICTION	PREVENTION OF UTILITY SWITCHING (3.12)	OUTSTANDING VERIFICATION FLAGS (3.20)	WORK REGISTRATION STATUS FLAGS (3.21)	DISQUALIFICATION FLAGS (3.24)	DUPLICATE PARTICIPATION CHECKS AT INTAKE (4.12)	SYSTEM DETERMINATION OF MR REQUIREMENT (6.15A)	SYSTEM DETERMINATION OF CERTIFICATION PERIOD (6.15B)	TRACKING OF RECERTIFICATION APPLICATION (7.06)
ALABAMA	NO	1	YES	A, ,C	0	NO	NO	NO
ALASKA	YES	2	YES	A, ,	3	YES	NO	YES
ARIZONA	NO	0	YES	A,B,C	2	NO	NO	NO
ARKANSAS	NO	0	YES	A, ,C	0	YES	NO	YES
CALIF-LOS ANGELES	NO	2	NO	A,B,C	3	NO	NO	NO
CALIF-SANTA CLARA	YES	2	YES	A, ,C	3	NO	YES	YES
CALIF-SAN BERNADINO	NO	0	YES	A,B,	3	NO	NO	YES
COLORADO	NO	1	YES	A, ,C	3	NO	NO	NO
CONNECTICUT	NO	0	NO	A,B,	0	NO	NO	NO
DELAWARE	NO	2	YES	A,B,C	3	YES	NO	NO
WASHINGTON,D.C.	NO	0	NO	NONE	0	NO	NO	NO
FLORIDA	NO	0	YES	A, ,C	3	YES	NO	NO
GEORGIA	NO	2	YES	A, ,C	3	YES	NO	YES
HAWAII	NO	2	YES	A,B,C	3	NO	NO	NO
IDAHO	NO	0	YES	NONE	0	NO	YES	NO
ILLINOIS	NO	1	YES	NONE	3	YES	NO	NO
INDIANA	NO	0	NO	NONE	3	NO	NO	NO
IOWA	YES	1	YES	A,B,C	3	NO	NO	NO
KANSAS	NO	0	NO	NONE	0	YES	NO	NO
KENTUCKY	YES	0	NO	A,B,C	2	YES	NO	NO
LOUISIANA	NO	1	YES	A, ,C	1	YES	NO	NO
MAINE	NO	0	YES	A,B,C	3	YES	NO	NO
MARYLAND	NO	0	NO	A, ,C	0	YES	NO	NO
MASSACHUSETTS	NO	0	NO	A, ,	0	NO	NO	NO
MICHIGAN	NO	0	YES	A, ,	0	YES	NO	NO
MINNESOTA-HENNEPIN	YES	2	YES	A,B,C	3	YES	YES	YES
MINNESOTA-KANDIYOHI	NO	1	YES	A, ,	0	YES	NO	NO
MISSISSIPPI	NO	2	YES	A,B,C	3	YES	YES	YES
MISSOURI	NO	0	YES	A, ,C	3	NO	NO	YES
MONTANA-CASCADE	NO	1	NO	NONE	3	NO	NO	NO
MONTANA-LEWIS+CLARK	NO	0	NO	A, ,	0	NO	NO	NO

Table of Contents

TABLE A.13
CASE MANAGEMENT CONTROLS AND FLAGS

JURISDICTION	PREVENTION OF UTILITY (3.12)	OUTSTANDING VERIFICATION (3.20)	WORK REGISTRATION (3.21)	DISQUALIFICATION (3.24)	DUPLICATE PARTICIPATION AT INTAKE (4.12)	SYSTEM DETERMINATION REQUIREMENT (6.15A)	SYSTEM DETERMINATION PERIOD (6.15B)	TRACKING OF RECERTIFICATION (7.06)
[redacted]								
NEBRASKA	NO	2	YES	A, ,	3	NO	NO	NO
NEVADA	NO	0	NO	A, ,C	3	NO	NO	NO
NEW HAMPSHIRE	NO	0	YES	A, ,C	1	YES	NO	NO
NEW JERSEY	NO	2	YES	A, ,	0	YES	YES	YES
NEW MEXICO	YES	1	YES	A, ,	3	NO	NO	NO
NEW YORK-UPSTATE	NO	0	YES	A, ,C	3	YES	NO	NO
NEW YORK-NYC	NO	0	YES	A,B,C	3	YES	YES	NO
NORTH CAROLINA	NO	1	YES	A, ,C	3	YES	NO	NO

TABLE A.14
AVAILABILITY OF CLAIMS-RELATED DATA

JURISDICTION	CLAIMS DATA (7.01)	CLAIMS BASIS (7.02)	COLLECTIONS (7.03)
ALABAMA	2	YES	YES
ALASKA	2	YES	YES
ARIZONA	0	NO	NO
ARKANSAS	2	YES	YES
CALIF-LOS ANGELES	1	YES	YES
CALIF-SANTA CLARA	2	YES	NO
CALIF-SAN BERNADINO	2	YES	NO
COLORADO	2	NO	NO
CONNECTICUT	1	YES	YES
DELAWARE	2	YES	YES
WASHINGTON,D.C.	0	NO	NO
FLORIDA	1	YES	NO
GEORGIA	2	YES	YES
HAWAII	1	YES	NO
IDAHO	2	NO	NO
ILLINOIS	2	YES	YES
INDIANA	0	NO	NO
IOWA	2	YES	YES
KANSAS	0	NO	NO
KENTUCKY	0	NO	NO
LOUISIANA	1	YES	YES
MAINE	2	YES	YES
MARYLAND	1	YES	YES
MASSACHUSETTS	0	NO	NO
MICHIGAN	2	YES	YES
MINNESOTA-HENNEPIN	2	YES	YES
MINNESOTA-KANDIYOHI	2	YES	YES
MISSISSIPPI	2	YES	YES
MISSOURI	2	YES	YES
MONTANA-CASCADE	0	NO	NO
MONTANA-LEWIS+CLARK	0	NO	NO

TABLE A.14
AVAILABILITY OF CLAIMS-RELATED DATA

JURISDICTION	CLAIMS DATA (7.01)	CLAIMS BASIS (7.02)	COLLECTIONS (7.03)
NEBRASKA	2	YES	NO
NEVADA	2	YES	YES
NEW HAMPSHIRE	0	NO	NO
NEW JERSEY	0	NO	NO
NEW MEXICO	0	NO	NO
NEW YORK-UPSTATE	1	YES	YES
NEW YORK-NYC	2	YES	YES
NORTH CAROLINA	0	NO	NO
OHIO-CUYAHOGA	0	NO	NO
OHIO-HAMILTON	2	YES	YES
OKLAHOMA	2	YES	YES
OREGON	2	YES	YES
PENNSYLVANIA	0	NO	NO
RHODE ISLAND	2	YES	YES
SOUTH CAROLINA	2	YES	YES
SOUTH DAKOTA	2	YES	YES
TENNESSEE	0	NO	NO
TEXAS	2	YES	NO
UTAH	0	NO	NO
VERMONT	2	YES	YES
VIRGINIA	1	YES	YES
WASHINGTON	0	NO	NO
WEST VIRGINIA	0	NO	NO
WISCONSIN	0	NO	NO
WYOMING	0	NO	NO
GUAM	1	YES	YES
VIRGIN ISLANDS	0	NO	NO

NOTE: CLAIMS DATA
0=DATABASE MAINTAINS NO DATA ON CLAIMS, 1=DATA ON SOME ACTIVE CLAIMS, 2=DATA ON ALL ACTIVE CLAIMS

TABLE A.15
ISSUANCE SUPPORT

JURISDICTION	ANY SUPPORT FOR ID ISSUANCE (6.14)	REGULAR ISSUANCE FROM ELIGIBILITY DATABASE (6.10)	FORMS OF ISSUANCE (6.11)	BENEFITS MAILED (6.12)
ALABAMA	YES	YES	A,B,	YES
ALASKA	YES	YES	A,B,	YES
ARIZONA	NO	YES	,B,	YES
ARKANSAS	NO	YES	,B,	YES
CALIF-LOS ANGELES	NO	YES	, ,C	NO
CALIF-SANTA CLARA	YES	YES	,B,C	YES
CALIF-SAN BERNADINO	YES	YES	A, ,	YES
COLORADO	NO	YES	,B,C	YES
CONNECTICUT	NO	YES	A, ,	YES
DELAWARE	NO	YES	A, ,	YES
WASHINGTON,D.C.	NO	YES	A, ,	YES
FLORIDA	NO	YES	,B,C	YES
GEORGIA	NO	YES	A,B,	YES
HAWAII	NO	YES	A, ,	YES
IDAHO	NO	YES	,B,	YES
ILLINOIS	NO	YES	,B,	YES
INDIANA	NO	YES	A, ,	YES
IOWA	YES	YES	,B,	YES
KANSAS	NO	YES	,B,	YES
KENTUCKY	YES	YES	A,B,	YES
LOUISIANA	NO	YES	A, ,	YES
MAINE	NO	YES	,B,	YES
MARYLAND	NO	YES	A,B,	YES
MASSACHUSETTS	YES	YES	A, ,	YES
MICHIGAN	YES	YES	,B,C	YES
MINNESOTA-HENNEPIN	YES	YES	A,B,C	YES
MINNESOTA-KANDIYOHI	NO	YES	,B,	YES
MISSISSIPPI	YES	YES	,B,C	YES
MISSOURI	NO	YES	A, ,	YES
MONTANA-CASCADE	NO	YES	A,B,	YES
MONTANA-LEWIS+CLARK	NO	YES	A, ,C	YES

TABLE A.15
ISSUANCE SUPPORT

JURISDICTION	ANY SUPPORT FOR ID ISSUANCE (6.14)	REGULAR ISSUANCE FROM ELIGIBILITY DATABASE (6.10)	FORMS OF ISSUANCE (6.11)	BENEFITS MAILED (6.12)
NEBRASKA	YES	YES	,B,C	YES
NEVADA	YES	YES	,B,	YES
NEW HAMPSHIRE	NO	YES	,B,	YES
NEW JERSEY	NO	YES	A, ,	YES
NEW MEXICO	NO	YES	,B,C	YES
NEW YORK-UPSTATE	NO	YES	A,B,	YES
NEW YORK-NYC	DK	YES	, ,C	NO
NORTH CAROLINA	NO	YES	A,B,C	YES
OHIO-CUYAHOGA	YES	YES	, ,C	YES[a]
OHIO-HAMILTON	YES	YES	A,B,	YES
OKLAHOMA	NO	YES	A,B,	YES
OREGON	YES	YES	,B,	YES
PENNSYLVANIA	NO	YES	A, ,C	YES
RHODE ISLAND	YES	YES	A, ,	YES
SOUTH CAROLINA	NO	YES	, ,C	YES[a]
SOUTH DAKOTA	NO	YES	A,B,	YES
TENNESSEE	NO	YES	A,B,	YES
TEXAS	YES	YES	A,B,	YES
UTAH	NO	YES	,B,C	YES
VERMONT	NO	YES	,B,	YES
VIRGINIA	NO	YES	A,B,	YES
WASHINGTON	YES	YES	A,B,	YES
WEST VIRGINIA	YES	YES	,B,	YES
WISCONSIN	YES	YES	,B,	YES
WYOMING	NO	YES	,B,	YES
GUAM	NO	YES	A, ,	YES
VIRGIN ISLANDS	NO	NO	NONE	NO

NOTE: FORMS OF ISSUANCE
A=ATP, B=LISTING FOR COUPON ISSUANCE, C=ELECTRONIC TRANSFER

[a] Mailings only for special circumstances.

TABLE A.16
PRODUCTION OF CASELOAD REPORTS FOR ELIGIBILITY STAFF

JURISDICTION	EDIT REPORTS (11.00A)	OUTSTANDING VERIFICATIONS (11.00B)	ACTIONS REQUIRED (11.00C)	ELIGIBILITY RESULTS (11.00D)	COMPUTER MATCH RESULTS (11.00E)	SUPERVISORY REPORT (11.03)
ALABAMA	0	0	4	0	2	NO
ALASKA	1	1	1	1	1	YES
ARIZONA	2	0	3	0	4	YES
ARKANSAS	0	0	4	0	4	YES
CALIF-LOS ANGELES	2	4	4	4	2	NO
CALIF-SANTA CLARA	2	2	4	2	4	YES
CALIF-SAN BERNADINO	2	0	4	0	0	NO
COLORADO	2	4	4	4	2	YES
CONNECTICUT	0	0	0	0	0	NO
DELAWARE	0	0	4	0	4	YES
WASHINGTON,D.C.	2	0	0	2	4	NO
FLORIDA	0	0	0	0	0	NO
GEORGIA	0	0	3	4	3	YES
HAWAII	0	4	4	0	5	YES
IDAHO	2	0	4	0	4	YES
ILLINOIS	0	0	0	0	4	NO
INDIANA	2	0	4	2	4	NO
IOWA	2	0	4	2	3	YES
KANSAS	2	0	4	2	4	YES
KENTUCKY	2	0	2	0	4	NO
LOUISIANA	1	0	4	1	4	YES
MAINE	4	4	4	4	3	YES
MARYLAND	0	0	4	4	0	YES
MASSACHUSETTS	2	0	4	0	4	YES
MICHIGAN	0	0	3	3	4	YES
MINNESOTA-HENNEPIN	1	0	4	1	5	NO
MINNESOTA-KANDIYOHI	2	4	4	2	0	YES
MISSISSIPPI	2	2	2	2	2	YES
MISSOURI	2	0	4	0	2	YES
MONTANA-CASCADE	0	4	0	0	0	NO
MONTANA-LEWIS+CLARK	0	0	0	4	0	NO

TABLE A.16
PRODUCTION OF CASELOAD REPORTS FOR ELIGIBILITY STAFF

JURISDICTION	EDIT REPORTS (11.00A)	OUTSTANDING VERIFICATIONS (11.00B)	ACTIONS REQUIRED (11.00C)	ELIGIBILITY RESULTS (11.00D)	COMPUTER MATCH RESULTS (11.00E)	SUPERVISORY REPORT (11.03)
NEBRASKA	0	2	0	2	2	YES
NEVADA	0	0	2	4	0	YES
NEW HAMPSHIRE	2	0	4	2	4	YES
NEW JERSEY	2	2	4	2	5	NO
NEW MEXICO	3	4	4	4	4	YES
NEW YORK-UPSTATE	0	4	4	5	5	YES
NEW YORK-NYC	2	0	4	0	5	NO
NORTH CAROLINA	0	0	4	0	5	YES
OHIO-CUYAHOGA	0	0	4	0	0	NO
OHIO-HAMILTON	0	4	4	0	4	YES
OKLAHOMA	1	4	4	2	1	NO
OREGON	0	4	4	4	4	NO
PENNSYLVANIA	2	0	4	0	4	NO
RHODE ISLAND	0	0	4	2	4	NO
SOUTH CAROLINA	0	0	4	5	0	YES
SOUTH DAKOTA	2	2	2	2	0	YES
TENNESSEE	2	0	4	0	2	NO
TEXAS	1	2	3	0	0	YES
UTAH	0	0	0	0	0	NO
VERMONT	1	1	1	1	1	YES
VIRGINIA	0	0	3	0	4	YES
WASHINGTON	0	0	0	0	0	NO
WEST VIRGINIA	0	0	4	0	3	YES
WISCONSIN	4	4	4	4	4	YES
WYOMING	0	0	4	0	0	NO
GUAM	0	0	4	4	4	YES
VIRGIN ISLANDS	0	0	0	0	0	NO

NOTE: THE TABLE ENTRIES REFLECT INTERVIEW CODING SCHEMES AS FOLLOWS:
0=REPORT NOT PRODUCED, 1=REAL-TIME ON DEMAND, 2=DAILY, 3=WEEKLY OR BIWEEKLY
4=MONTHLY, 5=OTHER

TABLE A.17
PRODUCTION OF FORMS AND NOTICES FOR HOUSEHOLDS

JURISDICTION	CERTIFICATION EXPIRATION NOTICE (11.04A)	APPOINTMENT NOTICES (11.04B)	VERIFICATION NOTICES (11.04C)	NOTIFICATION OF REPORTING FREQUENCIES (11.04D)	MONTHLY REPORT FORMS (11.04E	MONTHLY REPORT FILING WARNINGS (11.04F)	FAILURE TO FILE TERMINATION (11.04G)	APPLICATION ACTION NOTICES (11.04H)	INTERIM CHANGE/ RECERTIFICATION NOTICES (11.04I)
ALABAMA	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO
ALASKA	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
ARIZONA	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
ARKANSAS	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO
CALIF-LOS ANGELES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES
CALIF-SANTA CLARA	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
CALIF-SAN BERNADINO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
COLORADO	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES
CONNECTICUT	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
DELAWARE	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
WASHINGTON,D.C.	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
FLORIDA	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
GEORGIA	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
HAWAII	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
IDAHO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
ILLINOIS	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO
INDIANA	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
IOWA	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
KANSAS	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES
KENTUCKY	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
LOUISIANA	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
MAINE	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
MARYLAND	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES
MASSACHUSETTS	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
MICHIGAN	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
MINNESOTA-HENNEPIN	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
MINNESOTA-KANDIYOHI	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
MISSISSIPPI	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
MISSOURI	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
MONTANA-CASCADE	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
MONTANA-LEWIS+CLARK	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

TABLE A.17
PRODUCTION OF FORMS AND NOTICES FOR HOUSEHOLDS

JURISDICTION	CERTIFICATION EXPIRATION NOTICE (11.04A)	APPOINTMENT NOTICES (11.04B)	VERIFICATION NOTICES (11.04C)	NOTIFICATION OF REPORTING FREQUENCIES (11.04D)	MONTHLY REPORT FORMS (11.04E	MONTHLY REPORT FILING WARNINGS (11.04F)	FAILURE TO FILE TERMINATION (11.04G)	APPLICATION ACTION NOTICES (11.04H)	INTERIM CHANGE/ RECERTIFICATION NOTICES (11.04I)
NEBRASKA	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
NEVADA	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
NEW HAMPSHIRE	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
NEW JERSEY	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
NEW MEXICO	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
NEW YORK-UPSTATE	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO
NEW YORK-NYC	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
NORTH CAROLINA	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
OHIO-CUYAHOGA	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
OHIO-HAMILTON	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
OKLAHOMA	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
OREGON	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
PENNSYLVANIA	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES
RHODE ISLAND	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES
SOUTH CAROLINA	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES
SOUTH DAKOTA	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
TENNESSEE	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
TEXAS	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
UTAH	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
VERMONT	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
VIRGINIA	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
WASHINGTON	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
WEST VIRGINIA	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
WISCONSIN	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
WYOMING	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
GUAM	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES
VIRGIN ISLANDS	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

Table of Contents

APPENDIX B

CENSUS DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT

ID# |__|__|__|__|__|__|

AUTOMATED CERTIFICATION SYSTEM
STATE CENSUS INSTRUMENT

MODULE 1: SYSTEM IDENTIFICATION AND SCOPE

1.00 Is there a food stamp computer system operated by the State[1] in (STATE NAME)?

YES.....1
NO.....(GO TO 1.04).....0

1.01 What is the name of the system?

_____

1.02 When was this system first implemented for actual operations?

MONTH.....|__|__|
YEAR.....19|__|__|

1.03 What percentage of the state's food stamp caseload is handled in local offices or agencies that are served by this system?

PERCENT.....|__|__|__|
GO TO 2.00

1.04 Is your agency planning to implement a food stamp computer system?

YES.....1
NO.....(GO TO 2.00).....0

1.05 When will the system start operations?

MONTH.....|__|__|
YEAR.....19|__|__|

END

---

[1] "County" if this is a local jurisdiction interview. Substitute "county" for "state" throughout instrument.

MODULE 2: DATA COLLECTION SUPPORT FUNCTIONS

2.00 INTRODUCTION: First, I'd like to ask about how, if at all, eligibility workers use terminals during interviews with applicants or participants.

ENTER GENERAL NOTES HERE:

ENTER RESPONSES TO 2.01-2.07, GOING OVER INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS AS NECESSARY.

2.01 Are terminals used by eligibility workers during intake or recertification interviews?

NO.....(GO TO 3.00).....0
INTAKE.....1
RECERTIFICATION.....2
BOTH INTAKE AND RECERT.....3

2.02 Is your system designed so that eligibility workers can use terminals during interviews to actually enter applications or change data?

YES.....1
NO.....(GO TO 3.00).....0

2.03 Can the system print out a completed version of the application form based on data entered during an interview?

YES.....1
NO.....0

2.04 Do eligibility workers <u>have</u> to enter application data during the interview, or is it optional--that is, can they take the hardcopy application and then enter it later or have it entered?

REQUIRED.....(GO TO 2.06).....1
OPTIONAL.....2

2.05 In approximately what percentage of intake and recertification interviews do you think workers enter all of the application data during the interview?

INTAKE PERCENT.....|__|__|__|

RECERTIFICATION PERCENT.....|__|__|__|

NOTE: BASED ON OFFICES WHERE THIS FUNCTION IS AVAILABLE.

2.06 When eligibility workers enter data at a terminal during an interview, does the system actually prompt them with the wording or selection of the questions they are supposed to ask?

YES.....1
NO.....0

2.07 Does the system require that the worker enter some response for every question to be sure they were all asked, or does it allow the worker to enter data only for questions that have some substantive data to be entered?

ALL QUESTIONS REQUIRE RESPONSE.....1
SELECTED ENTRIES POSSIBLE.....2

MODULE 3: DATA BASE CONTENT

3.00 Does your system store any household information on computer files?

YES.....1
NO.....(GO TO 4.00).....0

3.01 Could you please give me a brief overview of the current information that is stored about households on computer files?

NOTES:

NOTE: WE ARE TALKING ABOUT THE COMPUTER FILES, NOT WHAT IS COLLECTED ON APPLICATION FORMS. FOR THIS SET OF QUESTIONS, 3.02 to 3.21, WE ARE REFERRING TO DATA ON THE CURRENT STATUS OF ACTIVE HOUSEHOLDS.)

3.02 Which individuals in a household are identified in the computer files? (CIRCLE "1" OR "0" FOR ALL ITEMS.)

	YES	NO
HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	1	0
SPOUSE OF HEAD	1	0
OTHER ADULTS	1	0
CHILDREN	1	0

3.03 What identifiers are used for the household and individuals? (CIRCLE "1" OR "0" FOR ALL ITEMS.)

		YES	NO
a. Household	SSN OF HEAD	1	0
	SPECIAL CASE #	1	0
	NAME OF HEAD	1	0
b. Individuals	SSN	1	0
	SPECIAL INDIVIDUAL ID	1	0
	NAME	1	0

3.04 For whom is information about gross employment earnings recorded in the data base?

(NOTE: WE ARE REFERRING TO GROSS EARNINGS AS REPORTED FOR EACH MEMBER, NOT THE COUNTABLE AMOUNT AFTER DEDUCTIONS THAT AFFECTS THE BENEFIT AMOUNT.)

NO DATA STORED ON GROSS EMPLOYMENT EARNINGS.....0

TOTAL ONLY--ALL GROSS EARNINGS RECORDED AS SINGLE AMOUNT EVEN IF SEVERAL EARNERS.....1

BY INDIVIDUAL--GROSS EARNINGS STORED SEPARATELY FOR EACH INDIVIDUAL EARNER.....2

3.05 How much detail is stored in the data base about self-employment income?

SYSTEM DOES NOT STORE ANY DATA EXPLICITLY ABOUT SELF-EMPLOYMENT INCOME; IT IS COMBINED WITH DATA ON OTHER SOURCES OR THE SYSTEM DOES NOT STORE ANY INCOME DATA.....0

SYSTEM STORES DATA ONLY ON NET SELF-EMPLOYMENT INCOME.....1

SYSTEM STORES DATA ON INCOME AND ALLOWABLE EXPENSE.....2

3.06 How does the data base store data on unearned income? (Is it broken down by source?) (Is it broken down by individual?)

NO DATA STORED ON UNEARNED INCOME AMOUNTS...(GO TO 3.08)....0

TOTAL UNEARNED INCOME (ACROSS ALL INDIVIDUALS AND ALL TYPES OF UNEARNED INCOME).....(GO TO 3.08)....1

TOTAL UNEARNED INCOME BY INCOME CATEGORIES FOR EACH TYPE OF INCOME ONLY (SUMMED ACROSS INDIVIDUALS).....2

TOTAL UNEARNED INCOME BY INCOME CATEGORIES FOR EACH INDIVIDUAL.....3

3.07 How many distinct categories of unearned income can be identified in the data base?

NUMBER.....|__|__|

3.08 Does the data base include the actual housing costs reported by applicants--that is, rent or mortgage expenses?

(NOTE: FOCUS HERE IS ON THE ACTUAL HOUSING COST REPORTED BY THE HOUSEHOLD, NOT INCLUDING SEPARATE UTILITIES AND NOT THE AMOUNT--AFTER ELIGIBILITY WORKER DECISIONS AND CALCULATIONS--THAT MIGHT GET USED IN THE BENEFIT CALCULATION.)

REPORTED HOUSING COST CANNOT BE ENTERED OR STORED IN DATA BASE.....0

REPORTED HOUSING COST CAN BE ENTERED, BUT COMMONLY ENTERED ONLY IF WORKER THINKS THERE WILL BE EXCESS SHELTER COST.....1

REPORTED HOUSING COST ALWAYS ENTERED AND STORED.....2

3.09 Does the state use standard utility allowances?

YES.....1
NO.....(GO TO 3.13).....0

3.10 For how many types of utility expense are standards used?

NUMBER OF CATEGORIES.....|__|__|

3.11 Do households have the option of using actual utility expense or the standard allowances?

YES.....1
NO.....(GO TO 3.13).....0

3.12 Does the system have any features which prevent households from making prohibited switches from the use of standard utility allowances to actual expenses or vice versa?

YES.....1
NO.....0

3.13 Does the data base include reported utility costs?

(NOTE: SAME POINT AS ABOVE; WE'RE TALKING ABOUT THE ACTUAL COST REPORTED BY HOUSEHOLDS, NOT THE UTILITY DEDUCTION COMPUTED AS AFFECTING THE ALLOTMENT.)

REPORTED UTILITY COSTS CANNOT BE ENTERED OR STORED IN DATA BASE.....(GO TO 3.15).....0

UTILITY COSTS AS REPORTED CAN BE ENTERED, BUT MAY NOT BE IF LESS THAN STANDARD ALLOWANCE OR IF STANDARD IS ELECTED.....1

UTILITY COSTS ALWAYS ENTERED AND STORED AS REPORTED EVEN IF STANDARD ALLOWANCE WILL BE USED.....2

3.14 When reported utility costs are entered and stored in the data base, does the data base reflect:

Only total reported utility costs.....1

Separate amounts for different types of utilities (e.g., electricity, gas, water).....2

3.15 Does the data base capture and store allowable medical expenses as reported by households with elderly/disabled members?

NOTE: FOCUS IS ON ALLOWABLE EXPENSES AS REPORTED.

DATA BASE DOES NOT CAPTURE MEDICAL EXPENSES AS REPORTED.....0

REPORTED EXPENSES STORED AS A TOTAL FOR WHOLE HOUSEHOLD.....1

REPORTED EXPENSES STORED FOR EACH ELDERLY/DISABLED INDIVIDUAL.....2

3.16 Does the data base capture and store reported dependent care expenses (for applicable cases)?

NOT STORED AS DISTINCT ELEMENT.....0
STORED AS REPORTED.....1

3.17 Now I want to find out, for each kind of expense, whether the eligibility worker has to compute the amount of the actual income deduction and enter it to the system, whether the systems computes and stores the deduction, or whether the system does not store the deduction amount.

INSTRUCTION: GO THRU LIST, REPEATING OPTIONS IF NECESSARY.

	Not Stored	Computed & Entered By Worker	System Computes & Stores
a. excess shelter deduction.....	0	1	2
b. utility cost component of excess shelter deduction.....	0	1	2
c. excess Medical deduction.....	0	1	2
d. dependent care deduction.....	0	1	2

3.18 How much information on resources (assets) is captured and stored in the data base?

NO DATA CAPTURED ON RESOURCE VALUE.....(GO TO 3.20).....0

ONLY COUNTABLE VALUE, TOTAL ACROSS TYPES.....1

ONLY COUNTABLE VALUE, BUT BY TYPE OF ASSET.....2

REPORTED VALUE OF ASSETS, BY TYPE, AND OTHER FACTORS AFFECTING COUNTABLE VALUE.....3

3.19 Is the entry of resource data required by procedures, or is it entered only if it is expected to exceed the resource ceiling?

OPTIONAL.....1
ALWAYS ENTERED--REQUIRED.....2

3.20 Does the data base maintain any flags showing whether there are outstanding verification requirements relating to a pending action (application, recertification, change, monthly report)?

DOES NOT PROVIDE ANY INDICATOR FOR OUTSTANDING VERIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.....0

MAINTAINS OVERALL FLAG SHOWING WHETHER THERE ARE ANY OUTSTANDING REQUIREMENTS.....1

MAINTAINS INFORMATION ON STATUS OF INDIVIDUAL VERIFICATION ITEMS.....2

3.21 Does the data base capture information relating to an individual's work registration status?

YES.....1
NO.....(GO TO 3.23).....0

3.22 What information is captured? (CIRCLE "1" OR "0" FOR ALL ITEMS.)

	YES	NO
INDICATION WHETHER INDIVIDUAL IS SUBJECT TO REGISTRATION OR IS EXEMPT	1	0
REASON FOR EXEMPTION	1	0
FLAG INDICATING OUTSTANDING COMPLIANCE OR EXEMPTION ISSUE	1	0
OTHER	1	0
(SPECIFY) _____		__|__|

3.23 Does the data base include any information concerning disqualification of individuals?

YES.....1
NO.....(GO TO 4.00).....0

3.24 What data is stored describing a disqualification? (CIRCLE "1" OR "0" FOR ALL ITEMS.)

	YES	NO
CODE INDICATING DISQUALIFICATION	1	0
PERIOD OF DISQUALIFICATION	1	0
REASON FOR DISQUALIFICATION	1	0

MODULE 4: AUTOMATION OF ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION

4.00 Does your system have any functions for automated eligibility determination?

YES.....1
NO.....(GO TO 5.00).....0

4.01 Could you give me a general description of how your system does automated eligibility determination?

NOTES:

Now I'd like to ask some specific questions to clarify what the system does to prepare the data needed for eligibility tests.

4.02 Which of the following functions can the system perform to convert raw data into the form needed for eligibility test comparisons:

a) compute net income from reported gross earnings, other income and deductions?
YES.....1
NO.....0

(NOTE: ENTAILS APPLYING 20% DEDUCTION TO EARNED INCOME, SUMMING ALL INCOME TYPES, AND SUBTRACTING STANDARD AND OTHER DEDUCTIONS)

b) compute countable resource value from reported value and other factors affecting countable value?
YES.....1
NO.....0

c) compute excess shelter cost deductions (Using housing costs, utility costs, and applicable income)?
YES.....1
NO.....0

d) Determine the utility component of the excess shelter deduction (by referring to reported utility costs and standard utility allowance(s)?
YES.....1
NO.....0

4.03 Does the system determine household size or does the worker have to enter the actual number of eligible individuals?

SYSTEM DETERMINES HOUSEHOLD SIZE.....1

WORKER MUST ENTER NUMBER OF ELIGIBLES
(GO TO 4.05).....0

4.04 In determining household size, does the system apply specific individual eligibility tests (e.g., work registration, ineligible alien), or does it simply count the number of people who have been entered to the file by the worker as "eligible"?

APPLIES INDIVIDUAL ELIGIBILITY TESTS.....1
COUNTS PEOPLE ENTERED AS ELIGIBLE.....0

4.05 Which of the following financial eligibility tests can the system perform?

a) gross income test
YES.....1
NO.....0

b) net income test
YES.....1
NO.....0

c) test of total resource value against resource ceiling
YES.....1
NO.....0

4.06 Can eligibility workers enter household and individual eligiblity results to the system? In other words, can the worker "turn off" or override the system's eligibility determination function?

YES.....1
NO....(GO TO 4.09).....0

4.07 If the worker enters eligibility results, does the system still check for errors and alert the worker?

YES.....1
NO.....0

4.08 In your estimate, in approximately what percentage of eligibility determinations does the worker determine eligibility rather than letting the system do it?

PERCENT.....|__|__|

4.09 Can the worker use the system to perform eligibility determinations on-line and get results right away?

YES.....1
NO.....(GO TO 5.00).....0

4.10 What percentage of eligibility determinations are done this way?

PERCENT.....|__|__|__|

NOTE: LESS THAN 100% MEANS WORKER CAN ALSO SUBMIT TRANSACTIONS (ONLINE OR WITH INPUT FORM) AND LET PROCESSING GO ON IN BATCH MODE.

4.11 Does the system perform a "duplicate participation" check at intake?

YES.....1
NO.....(GO TO 5.00).....0

4.12 Is this check done on-line by staff in the office where the application is being taken, or in a batch process? Or is it partially on-line and partially batch?

TOTALLY BATCH.....1

ON-LINE VS. LOCAL OFFICE CASELOAD OR PART OF STATE; BATCH FOR REST OF STATE CASELOAD.....2

ON-LINE VS. WHOLE STATE CASELOAD.....3

MODULE 5: BENEFIT CALCULATION FUNCTIONS

5.00 Can the system perform benefit calculations or does the worker always have to calculate the amount to be issued?

SYSTEM CAN COMPUTE COUPON AMOUNT.....1

WORKER ALWAYS HAS TO COMPUTE COUPON AMOUNT.....(GO TO 6.08)....0

5.01 Which of the following calculation functions can the system perform as part of computing the coupon (issuance) amount?

a) Calculation of food stamp net income (application of 20% earned income deduction, standard deduction, summing of income and subtraction of allowable expense deductions)

YES.....1
NO.....0

b) Look-up or calculation of coupon amount based on net income and household size (before proration and recoupment)

YES.....1
NO.....0

c) Proration of initial month's benefit based on application date

YES.....1
NO.....0

d) Deduction of recoupment amount

YES.....1
NO.....0

5.02 Can the eligibility worker use the system on-line to get immediate benefit calculation results?

YES.....1
NO.....(GO TO 6.00).....0

5.03 In approximately what percentage of transactions are benefit calculations done on-line?

PERCENT.....|__|__|__|

MODULE 6: FUNCTIONAL INTEGRATION

6.00 Would you please describe how workers use the benefit calculation functions?

NOTES:

6.01 Can the eligibility worker determine and input the benefit issuance amount manually instead of letting the system determine it? (i.e., Can the worker "override" a system-calculated issuance amount?)

NOTE: "NO" IMPLIES THAT SYSTEM ALWAYS DETERMINES ISSUANCE AMOUNT.

YES.....1
NO.....(GO TO 6.03).....0

6.02 For about what percentage of applications do you estimate the worker manually computes and inputs the benefit?

PERCENT.....|__|__|

6.03 When the worker uses the system's automated benefit calculation, are the results automatically stored in the household data base, or do the results have to be re-entered?

RESULTS AUTOMATICALLY STORED.....1

RESULTS MUST BE RE-ENTERED TO
STORE ON DATA BASE.....(GO TO 6.06).....0

6.04 Does the eligibility worker have to examine benefit and eligibility results determined by the system and then input an approval of the results to trigger issuance?

NO.....(GO TO 6.06).....0
YES, SOMETIMES.....1
YES, ALWAYS.....(GO TO 6.06).....2

6.05 In what percentage of the cases?

PERCENT.....|__|__|

6.06 When the system determines food stamp eligibility, does it automatically retrieve data on income from other benefit programs, or does the worker have to input those benefits as income on the FS transaction?

SYSTEM CAN RETRIEVE BENEFIT INCOME FOR SOME PROGRAM(S).....1

WORKER MUST ENTER ALL BENEFIT INCOME.....(GO TO 6.08).....0

6.07 For which other programs can the system retrieve benefit income for use in food stamp eligibility processing? (CIRCLE "1" OR "0" FOR ALL ITEMS.)

	YES	NO
AFDC	1	0
GA	1	0
SSI	1	0
SSA	1	0
ENERGY ASSISTANCE	1	0
OTHER	1	0
SPECIFY _____		|__|__|

6.08 When application data are entered to the system, from what document are they entered?

A SEPARATE INPUT FORM PREPARED BY THE ELIGIBILITY WORKER AFTER ALL MANUAL COMPUTATIONS ARE FINISHED.....1

A COMBINATION WORKSHEET/INPUT FORM.....2

THE APPLICATION FORM WITH ADDITIONAL DATA ENTERED ON IT BY THE WORKER.....3

THE APPLICATION AS COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (WITHOUT WORKER ENTRIES).....4

6.09 For about what percentage of applications do you estimate workers have to complete a worksheet?

PERCENT.....|__|__|__|

6.10 Does the system generate regular issuance authorizations based on the eligibility data base?

YES.....1
NO.....(GO TO 6.12).....0

6.11 In what form are issuance authorizations generated? (NOTE: MAY BE DIFFERENT FOR VARIOUS PARTS OF STATE; CIRCLE "1" OR "0" FOR ALL ITEMS.)

	YES	NO
ATPs	1	0
LISTING FOR COUPON ISSUANCE	1	0
DATA BASE FOR ELECTRONIC TRANSFER OR OTHER ON-LINE ISSUANCE.....(GO TO 7.00).....	1	0
OTHER.....(GO TO 7.00).....	1	0
(SPECIFY) _____		__|__|

6.12 Are benefits (ATPs or coupons) mailed?

YES.....1
NO.....(GO TO 6.14).....0

6.13 Does the data base capture the mailing date?

YES.....1
NO.....0

6.14 Does the system provide any prompts or information to support issuance of ID cards?

YES.....1
NO.....0

IF YES, DESCRIBE IN NOTES:

6.15 Does the system determine whether a household is subject to monthly reporting or its certification period based on household characteristics and agency rules?

a. Subject to monthly YES.....1

b. Certification period? YES.....1
NO.....0

MODULE 7: SCOPE OF AUTOMATED DATA BASE

7.00 Now we would like to know whether certain other kinds of data are maintained in the current data base, that is, information that is not necessarily used for eligibility determination or current issuance, but that relates to overall case management.

NOTE: WE ARE INTERESTED IN WHETHER THE DATA MENTIONED IN EACH QUESTION IS AVAILABLE TO THE ELIGIBILITY WORKER. IF INFORMATION IS ON A COMPUTER FILE BUT NOT ACCESSIBLE TO ELIGIBILITY WORKERS, ANSWER SHOULD BE "NO". THE ISSUE IS WHETHER THE WORKER CAN USE SIMILAR METHODS (WHETHER ONLINE INQUIRY OR REGULAR REPORT) TO ACCESS THIS INFORMATION AS ARE USED TO ACCESS CURRENT HOUSEHOLD ELIGIBILITY FILES.

7.01 Does the current data base include information for each household showing claims established against the households for previous overissuances?

NO DATA ON CLAIMS.....(GO TO 7.04).....0
DATA ON SOME ACTIVE CLAIMS.....1
DATA ON ALL ACTIVE CLAIMS.....2

7.02 Does the data base show the basis for the claim (i.e. IPV, Household non-IPV, Agency error)?

YES.....1
NO.....0

7.03 Does the current data base also include information on collections made against claims established for individual households?

YES.....1
NO.....0

7.04 Does the household data base show whether the household has exchanged its ATP for coupons (or received its coupons via other required transactions)?

NO TRANSACTION REQUIRED; COUPONS ARE MAILED.....1

BENEFIT TRANSACTION REQUIRED; DATA BASE
DOES NOT SHOW IT.....2

BENEFIT TRANSACTION REQUIRED, AND DATA BASE
SHOWS TRANSACTION (ATP OR OTHER).....3

7.05 Does the system maintain information for the worker showing whether households under Monthly Reporting have or have not filed their latest report?

YES.....1
NO.....0

7.06 Does the system maintain information for the worker indicating whether a household due for recertification has submitted its reapplication form?

YES.....1
NO.....0

7.07 Now I would like to ask about the extent to which your system maintains historical data that is readily available to eligibility workers.

Does the system maintain an accessible data base only on the current status of households, or is there also some historical data maintained?

NOTE: HISTORY MAY BE ON-LINE OR ON TAPE, AS LONG AS IT IS IN A FORM THAT THE COMPUTER SYSTEM CAN RETRIEVE AT WORKER REQUEST.

CURRENT STATUS ONLY.....(GO TO 8.00).....1

HISTORY MAINTAINED.....2

7.08 Are any historical data maintained on the same data base as the current data (same medium, same mode of access)?

YES.....1
NO.....0

7.09 Are any historical data--that is, older records or data for older periods--maintained in machine-readable "archives" that are less accessible but still available to eligibility staff?

NOTE: WE ARE INTERESTED IN DETERMINING WHETHER ANY HISTORICAL DATA IS MAINTAINED IN A "DOWNGRADED" FORM--I.E., PERHAPS LESS ACCESSIBLE MEDIUM, SUCH AS TAPES THAT HAVE TO BE MOUNTED ON SPECIAL REQUEST, OR PERHAPS ON DISK, BUT REQUIRING A SPECIAL REQUEST TO THE HISTORY FILE TO ACCESS.

YES.....1
NO.....0

7.10 INTERVIEWER CHECK ITEM — WHAT IS THE ANSWER TO 7.08?

YES.....(CONTINUE).....1
NO.....(GO TO 7.14).....0

7.11 With regard to the historical data that is maintained as part of the current data base, is the same information included in the historical records as in the current status records? Or is the historical data abbreviated or just a summary?

HISTORICAL DATA IS ABBREVIATED OR SUMMARY.....1

SAME DATA AS FOR CURRENT STATUS....(GO TO 7.13)...2

7.12 Please describe briefly in what way the historical data are abbreviated or summarized.

NOTES:

7.13 Still speaking of historical data maintained in the current data base, how long is the maximum history length that can be maintained in that way?

NOTE: ANSWER COULD BE IN TERMS OF THE NUMBER OF PREVIOUS STATUS CHANGES OR ACTIONS TAKEN, OR IT COULD BE IN TERMS OF THE NUMBER OF MONTHS OF ELIGIBILITY OR ISSUANCE. WE ARE LOOKING FOR THE MAXIMUM NUMBER OF PRIOR ACTIONS OR PERIODS THAT WOULD APPEAR ON CURRENT DATA BASE.

|__|__| ACTIONS OR STATUS CHANGES (1-N). (ENTER "99" IF NO LIMIT AND HISTORY IS IN THE FORM OF PREVIOUS ACTIONS.)

|__|__| MONTHS (1-N). (ENTER "99" IF NO LIMIT AND HISTORY IS IN THE FORM OF RECORDS FOR MONTHS.)

7.14 INTERVIEWER CHECK ITEM — WHAT IS THE ANSWER TO 7.09?

YES.....(CONTINUE).....1
NO.....(GO TO 8.00).....0

7.15 Now with regard to historical data maintained in a less accessible form, does that data include all of the information contained in the current status data base, or is it abbreviated or summarized?

HISTORICAL DATA IS ABBREVIATED OR SUMMARY.....1

SAME DATA AS FOR CURRENT STATUS....(GO TO 7.17)...2

7.16 Please describe briefly in what way the historical data are abbreviated or summarized.

NOTES:

7.17 Still talking about historical files for the older data, what is the maximum length of the history that can be maintained there?

|__|__| ACTIONS OR STATUS CHANGES (1-N). (ENTER "99" IF NO LIMIT AND HISTORY IS IN THE FORM OF PREVIOUS ACTIONS.)

|__|__| MONTHS (1-N). (ENTER "99" IS NO LIMIT AND HISTORY IS IN THE FORM OF RECORDS FOR MONTHS.)

MODULE 8: ELIGIBILITY WORKER ACCESS TO DATA BASE

8.00 Now I have some questions about how eligibility workers can get information from the data base about individual households.

Can eligibility workers initiate requests for information from the computer data base, or do they have to rely on routine reports on case status?

WORKERS CAN INITIATE.....1

ROUTINE REPORTS ONLY.....(GO TO 9.00).....0

NOTE: IF WORKERS RECEIVE HARD COPY TURNAROUND DOCUMENTS WHENEVER A CASE ACTION IS COMPLETED, AND KEEP THEM ON FILE FOR THE NEXT ACTION, THAT IS CONSIDERED A "ROUTINE REPORT," NOT A "WORKER-INITIATED REQUEST."

8.01 If eligibility workers request household information from the data base, can they get the information in hard-copy form?

YES.....1
NO.....(GO TO 8.04).....0

8.02 How far back in historical data can workers go to get a hard-copy report of household data from the system?

|__|__| ACTIONS (ENTER "99" IF NO LIMIT.)

|__|__| MONTHS (ENTER "99" IF NO LIMIT.)

8.03 If eligibility workers request a hard-copy report of household data, how long do they usually have to wait for a response?

LESS THAN 5 MINUTES.....1
6-60 MINUTES.....2
1-8 HOURS.....3
NEXT DAY.....4
2-5 DAYS.....5

8.04 Can they get an on-line display?

YES.....1
NO.....(GO TO 9.00).....0

8.05 Can workers do on-line inquiries to only the current household status, or also to historical data?

CURRENT STATUS ONLY.....(GO TO 9.00).....1

HISTORICAL AS WELL AS CURRENT DATA BASE.....2

8.06 How far back in historical data can workers go in an on-line inquiry?

|__|__| ACTIONS (ENTER "99" IF NO LIMIT.)

|__|__| MONTHS (ENTER "99" IF NO LIMIT.)

MODULE 9: CONVENIENCE OF SYSTEM TRANSACTIONS

Now I have a few questions about how data gets into the system and how updates and eligibility determination are done.

I'd like to ask about the speed and convenience of the process for correcting edit problems on household actions and updating the household record.

9.00 What kinds of edit results are available to an eligibility worker or data entry clerk on-line right away after an application or change action has been entered?

NONE.....0

INTERNAL CONSISTENCY AND RANGE EDITS ONLY
(EDITS ONLY ON FORM ITSELF).....1

INTERNAL EDITS AND EDITS AGAINST THE EXISTING DATA BASE
(PREVIOUSLY ENTERED DATA FOR THE HOUSEHOLD).....2

9.01 If the data entered for a household action is free of edit problems, when is the household's record updated on the eligibility file used to generate issuance authorizations?

NOTE: UPDATE MAY BE BATCH EVEN IF ENTRY IS DONE BY WORKER ON-LINE. CONSIDER UPDATE TO BE ON-LINE ONLY IF IT IS USUALLY COMPLETED WHILE THE WORKER WAITS FOR ITS COMPLETION.

UPDATE ALWAYS DONE IN BATCH PROCESSING.....1

IMMEDIATE ON-LINE UPDATE POSSIBLE, BUT NOT ALWAYS USED.....2

ALWAYS DONE IMMEDIATELY (ON-LINE UPDATE)....(GO TO 10.00).....3

9.02 When an update is performed in batch processing, what is the usual time before it is done?

NOTE: THE INTERVAL WE ARE INTERESTED IN BEGINS WHEN THE DATA ENTERED ARE CLEAN--I.E., ANY PROBLEMS HAVE BEEN CORRECTED.

DURING THE DAY THE DATA ARE ENTERED (AND CLEAN).....1

OVERNIGHT.....2

LONGER.....3

MODULE 10: ACCESS TO SYSTEM TERMINALS

10.00 Do eligibility workers have access to terminals?

YES.....1
NO.....(GO TO 11.00).....0

10.01 Where are the terminals used by eligibility workers generally located?

ON THEIR OWN DESKS.....1

CENTRAL LOCATION FOR THEIR UNIT.....2

CENTRAL LOCATION IN THE OFFICE.....3

OTHER.....4

(SPECIFY) _____|__|__|

10.02 For the state as a whole (or the whole area served by this system), what is the ratio of terminals available to eligibility workers to the number of eligibility workers?

(ENTER EITHER ACTUAL NUMBER OF TERMINALS AND WORKERS, OR NUMBERS REPRESENTING TYPICAL RATIO.)

TERMINALS.....|__|__|, |__|__|__|

TO

ELIGIBILITY WORKERS.....|__|__|, |__|__|__|

NOTE: DO NOT INCLUDE TERMINALS STRICTLY RESERVED FOR DATA ENTRY CLERKS.

MODULE 11: FUNCTIONS TO AID IN WORK ORGANIZATION

Now there are some questions about things the system may provide to help eligibility staff organize their work, manage their caseload, and handle communications with Food Stamp households.

11.00 How often do eligibility workers receive caseload reports on the following kinds of information?

NOTE: THE "REAL-TIME ON DEMAND" ANSWER IS APPROPRIATE ONLY IF THE REPORT THAT CAN BE VIEWED ON-LINE IS TRULY A "REAL-TIME" REPORT--ALWAYS REFLECTING ALL ACTIONS TAKEN UP TO THAT TIME. IF THE ON-LINE REPORT IS ACTUALLY A DISPLAY OF A REPORT THAT IS UPDATED AT SCHEDULED INTERVALS, DETERMINE THE INTERVAL AND USE OTHER RESPONSE CATEGORIES.

NOTE: DOCUMENTS ON INDIVIDUAL HOUSEHOLDS ARE NOT "REPORTS". WE ARE TALKING ABOUT SUMMARY OR COMPREHENSIVE REPORTS THAT BRING TOGETHER INFO ON WORKER'S WHOLE CASELOAD.

	REAL-TIME ON-DEMAND	DAILY	WEEKLY OR BI-WEEKLY	MONTHLY	NEVER	OTHER	PRIORITIES	
							Yes	No
a) Edit Problems on Case Actions	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	0
							Yes	No
b) Outstanding verifications needed	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	0
							Yes	No
c) Case actions due (e.g. eligibility approval, issuance authorization, recertification)	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	0
							Yes	No
d) Results of automated eligibility determination	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	0
							Yes	No
e) Results of computer matches (discrepancies requiring follow-up)	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	0

11.01 INSTRUCTION: ANY CASELOAD REPORTS FOR ELGIBILITY WORKERS?

YES.....1
NO.....(GO TO 11.03).....0

11.02 Do any of the reports prioritize the necessary worker action or follow-up? (e.g. by importance or type of action, or time pending).

YES.....1 ---> CIRCLE "YES" OR "NO" FOR
NO.....0 EACH REPORT TYPE UNDER "PRIORITIES" ABOVE.

11.03 Does the system generate a regular report for eligibility unit supervisors which summarizes the actions taken by their unit?

NOTE: SUCH A REPORT MAY BE PRINTED REGULARLY, OR BE AVAILABLE ON-LINE TO A SUPERVISOR.

YES.....1
NO.....0

11.04 What kinds of notices or forms does the system print to be sent to households? Does it issue:

a) Notices that the certification period will soon expire?
YES.....1
NO.....0

b) Notices telling of appointments for households to come into the office (e.g., for recertification interview, or application interview)?
YES.....1
NO.....0

c) Notices identifying outstanding requirements for verification or documentation that must be satisfied for approval?
YES.....1
NO.....0

d) Notification of Required Reporting Frequency (that is, a notification that the household must file monthly reports)?
YES.....1
NO.....0

e) Monthly report forms to households on MRRB?
YES.....1
NO.....0

f) Warning notices to households who fail to file a monthly report by a certain date?
YES.....1
NO.....0

g) Termination notices to households who fail to file a monthly report by the final filing deadline and who are terminated as a result?
YES.....1
NO.....0

h) Approval and denial notices based on application action?
YES.....1
NO.....0

i) Benefit reduction or termination notices based on the processing of interim changes or recertifications?
YES.....1
NO.....0

MODULE 12: FOOD STAMP/AFDC INTEGRATION

12.00 Does your state have "generic workers" who handle AFDC and food stamps for PA households?

YES.....1
NO.....(GO TO 13.01).....0

12.01 Does your state use a combined application form for AFDC and food stamps?

YES.....1
NO.....0

12.02 When application or recertification data is prepared for an AFDC/FS household, does the worker use a single input form (or input screen) that allows entry of data that will affect both AFDC and FS benefits?

YES.....1
NO.....(GO TO 12.04).....0

12.03 If data about an individual is relevant to both AFDC and food stamps, can it be entered on the input form just once, or must it be entered in separate places on the form for AFDC and food stamps?

SEPARATE ENTRIES.....1

ONCE.....2

12.04 When an eligibility worker who handles AFDC/FS households receives a regular caseload report, does it list information relevant to both AFDC and FS in one combined report, or must the worker consult separate reports for the same household?

NO REGULAR CASELOAD REPORTS.....0

SEPARATE REPORTS.....1

ONE REPORT.....2

MODULE 13: AGENCY STAFF, COSTS AND CASE VOLUME

13.01 What was the average monthly number of participating households statewide for 1985?

HOUSEHOLDS.....|__|, |__|__|__|, |__|__|__|

13.02 What was the average monthly number of fulltime equivalent staff in each of the following categories statewide in 1985: (WE MEAN NUMBER OF FTE's CHARGED TO FSP.)

Eligibility workers?.....|__|__|__|, |__|__|__|

Eligibility supervisors?.....|__|__|__|, |__|__|__|

Clerical staff in eligibility units?.....|__|__|__|, |__|__|__|

13.03 What was the average salary of eligibility workers statewide in 1985? (NOT COUNTING FRINGE OR OVERHEAD)

NOTE: COMPUTE AS TOTAL SALARY COSTS FOR ELIGIBILITY WORKERS DIVIDED BY NUMBER OF FTEs

AVERAGE ANNUAL SALARY...|__|__|, |__|__|__|

13.04 What is the ratio of fringe benefits to direct salary costs for eligibility staff statewide? (EXPRESS AS PERCENTAGE)

PERCENT.....|__|__|

13.05 In 1985, what was the total number of the following actions statewide:

Initial applications and reapplications processed? (including expedited service).....|__|, |__|__|__|, |__|__|__|

Expedited service applications processed?.....|__|, |__|__|__|, |__|__|__|

Recertifications performed?.....|__|, |__|__|__|, |__|__|__|

Interim actions?.....|__|, |__|__|__|, |__|__|__|

13.06 What was the percentage of initial applications approved in 1985 statewide?

PERCENT.....|__|__|

13.07 What was the percentage of recertifications approved in 1985?

PERCENT.....|__|__|

13.08 What was the total number of closures (terminations) of participating households in 1985 statewide?

NUMBER.....|__|, |__|__|__|, |__|__|__|

13.09 What percentage of those closures were due to "not appearing for recertification"?

PERCENT.....|__|__|

13.10 Besides that reason, what was the most frequent reason for closure of participating households, and what percentage of closures did it account for in 1985?

REASON: _____ |__|__| PERCENT

MODULE 14: HARDWARE/SOFTWARE

14.00 What hardware is used for processing food stamp transactions? (What manufacturer/brand?)

a. For central processing? (CIRCLE ONE OR MORE.)

IBM	1
Burroughs	1
Digital (DEC)	1
Sperry/Univac	1
Honeywell	1
Control Data	1
Other: _____	1

b. Local processing (micros/minis) (CIRCLE ONE OR MORE IF THERE IS LOCAL PROCESSING.)

IBM	1
Burroughs	1
Digital (DEC)	1
Sperry/Univac	1
Honeywell	1
Control Data	1
Other: _____	1

14.01 Does your system generate reports to meet federal requirements? (e.g. FNS-46, etc.)

YES.....1
NO.....0

14.02 Is your system an adaptation or direct application of a system from another state or local agency?

YES.....1
NO.....(GO TO 14.04).....0

14.03 Which state's system did you use as the basis for your system?

STATE NAME: _____ |__|__|

14.04 When do you expect implementation of the next major functional changes in your state's system--changes which would significantly alter the system profile that this interview portrays?

MONTH.....|__|__|

YEAR.....19 |__|__|